Class BS1225

Book .Z6

Copyright No.

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

THE WORD OF TRUTH

VOLUME I.

THE PENTATEUCH

BY

E. V. ZOLLARS, A. M., LL. D.

PRESIDENT OF OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

Author of "Bible Geography," "The Great Salvation," "Hebrew Prophecy," etc.

"Give diligence to present thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth."—2 Tim. 2:15.

THE STANDARD PUBLISHING COMPANY
CINCINNATI, OHIO

c1910

BS1225
.Z6

Copyrighted, 1910, by
THE STANDARD PUBLISHING COMPANY,
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

©CI.A273277

Recat. HLR 25 N 40

To the Wife of My Youth,

The Companion and Helpmeet of My

Maturer Years,

The Sharer of My Aspirations,

Hopes and Joys,

This Volume is Lovingly Dedicated.

PREFACE

WHILE this volume is confined to the Pentateuch, it is the purpose of the author to follow it with an additional volume, possibly with two volumes, on the other books of the Bible. The work, as a whole, may be denominated Biblical Introduction, although in some of its features it is somewhat different from a work of that kind. The general treatment proceeds from the conservative standpoint, because of the growing conviction of the author that the methods used and results obtained by the divisive school are utterly erroneous and untrustworthy. No claim of originality is set up, either as to arguments in answer to the contentions of the divisive school, or in support of the conservative position. Nor are new arguments necessary, since the theories of the destructive critics have been overthrown and their arguments triumphantly answered by such men as Green, Bissell, Anderson, McGarvey, and many others. The effort is made, so far as the work deals with critical questions, to put such discussions into as simple a form as possible, such as is suitable for the layman, the preacher and the general Bible student who does not have time or opportunity for extended investigation. There is also introduced a considerable amount of matter that is of a practical character, bearing on duty and service; in short, upon life in many of its phases. To this end, the most obvious lessons of the various books are brought out. It would seem, therefore, that the work is a combination of Biblical Introduction and Hermeneutics in its broad aspects.

It is hoped that the book will be found serviceable for the classroom, the Bible school and for the private study. It is the aim of this volume to present in simple form a general knowledge of the books of the Pentateuch, and of the critical questions connected therewith, without going into the latter subject in a minute way, owing to its complicated character and its profitless and unpractical nature to the general student.

It is the earnest wish of the author that the Bible student, who gives this volume a reasonably careful study, will have gleaned much valuable information concerning the books of Moses, and will have acquired an understanding of the leading arguments set forth in defense of their truly historic character.

INDEX

PART I.

The Bible as a Whole.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

The importance dignity of Bible study..... 1
The Bible, the primary text-book on God..... 3
The Bible as related to human progress and civilization.... 5
The Bible as a book of history..... 7
The Bible as a book of literature..... 8
The Bible as a book of ethics..... 10
The Bible as a modern book..... 12
The Bible, the revelation of God's plan of redemption..... 13
The Bible's view of man..... 15
The Bible's method of teaching..... 16
The Bible as a quickening and transforming power..... 18
The Bible as a sustaining power..... 19
The Bible as a telescope..... 21

CHAPTER II.

The Bible as a whole..... 23
The question of inspiration..... 25
The names given to the sacred writings..... 27
Striking peculiarities of the Bible..... 29

CHAPTER III.

The Bible divided into Old and New Testaments..... 36
Analysis, the nature of the process..... 36
The Bible divided according to will or testament..... 39

CHAPTER IV.

Divisions of the Old Testament..... 50
The Old Testament divided according to literary character.. 51
The Old Testament divided according to literary form..... 53
The Old Testament, Scripture method of division..... 57
The Old Testament divided by books..... 58
The Old Testament divided according to purpose..... 61

CHAPTER V.

PAGE
Periods of Old Testament literature..... 64
The Oral period of Revelation..... 64
The Mosaic period of Revelation.....67
The Davidic period of Revelation..... 69
The Prophetic period of Revelation..... 72
The Restoration period of Revelation..... 78
The period of arrangement..... 80
The Apocrypha..... 81

PART II.

The Authorship of the Pentateuch.

CHAPTER VI.

The authorship of the Pentateuch, preliminary matters..... 85
A method of study..... 85
Contents of the Pentateuch..... 88
The life and work of Moses..... 91
What Moses received from others as a foundation..... 96

CHAPTER VII.

Two Rival Theories Considered..... 102
Two theories compared..... 102
Reasons standing against the analytical theory..... 110

CHAPTER VIII.

The Testimony found in the Pentateuch, Historical Books and the Psalms..... 124
The testimony of the Pentateuch as to its authorship..... 124
The testimony of the Historical Books as to the authorship of the Pentateuch..... 128
The testimony of the Psalms as to the authorship of the Pentateuch 134

CHAPTER IX.

Testimony of the Prophetic Books and the New Testament.. 146
Testimony of the Prophetic Books as to the authorship of the Pentateuch..... 146
Testimony of the New Testament as to the authorship of the Pentateuch..... 171

CHAPTER X.

PAGE
Other arguments for the Mosaic authorship..... 175

PART III.

The Book of Beginnings.

CHAPTER XI.

The Beginning of the Material Universe and of man..... 189
The beginning of the material universe..... 191
The beginning of humanity..... 197

CHAPTER XII.

The Beginning of Family and Business Life..... 200
The beginning of family life..... 200
The beginning of business life..... 206

CHAPTER XIII.

The Beginning of Probation..... 212
The conditions under which man was tested..... 213
The nature of the test..... 214
The nature of the penalty..... 216
The lessons of the test..... 217

CHAPTER XIV.

The Beginning of Sin and Its Attendant Evils..... 223
The beginning of sin..... 224
The beginning of fear..... 228
The beginning of envy..... 231
The beginning of violence..... 234

CHAPTER XV.

The Beginning of Altruism and Human Redemption..... 237
The beginning of altruism..... 238
The beginning of redemption..... 244

CHAPTER XVI.

The Beginning of Religion and Judgment..... 257
The beginning of natural religion..... 257
The beginning of revealed religion..... 261
The beginning of judgment..... 264

PART IV.

The Separate Books of the Pentateuch.

CHAPTER XVII.

PAGE
The Book of Genesis 273
The Book of Genesis, its character 274
The Book of Genesis, its unity 276
The Book of Genesis, not in conflict with science 279
The Book of Genesis, how produced 289
The Book of Genesis, its divisions 292
The Book of Genesis, its design 294

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Book of Exodus 296
The Book of Exodus, its character 296
The Book of Exodus, its divisions 298
The Book of Exodus, its design 300
The Book of Exodus, its relations to Genesis 302
The Book of Exodus, its doctrines 303

CHAPTER XIX.

The Book of Leviticus 305
The Book of Leviticus, its peculiarities 305
The Book of Leviticus, its divisions 306
The Book of Leviticus, its design 308
The Book of Leviticus, its credibility 310
The Book of Leviticus, its lessons 311

CHAPTER XX.

The Book of Numbers 315
The Book of Numbers, its lack of proportion 315
The Book of Numbers, its logical place in the history 317
The Book of Numbers, the results achieved by wilderness experience 318
The Book of Numbers, summary of its contents 323
The Book of Numbers, its credibility 324

CHAPTER XXI.

The Book of Deuteronomy 326
The Book of Deuteronomy, reasons for repetition of the law 327
The Book of Deuteronomy, its contents 328
The Book of Deuteronomy, its purpose 331
The Book of Deuteronomy, its truthfulness 334
The Book of Deuteronomy, its lessons 335
Conclusion 337
Authorities consulted 338

PART I.

The Bible as a Whole.

THE WORD OF TRUTH

CHAPTER I.

The Importance and Dignity of Bible Study.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

1. When man comes with reverent and receptive mind to the study of God's word it is impossible to exaggerate the dignity and importance of the undertaking. It is a serious occasion because of the radical effects and far-reaching consequences that must inevitably follow such an exercise, and it is a sacred occasion because of the divine character of the book with which the student deals.

When Moses came to the burning bush God said, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." So when we approach this flame of divine lighting let it be with the feeling that we are about to tread on holy ground. We shall never be the same after this study that we are now or would have been without it. The reading of any book is a very serious question. It will leave its mark; it will change the mental texture and color. The question of what to read or what not to read demands serious consideration. It will be readily

admitted that the forming of companionships is a very grave question, because the whole course of life is affected thereby. It is also well understood that the body is affected by everything eaten. Wholesome food is absolutely essential in order to maintain a sound body. The same principles hold good in the intellectual domain. Everything taken into the mind has its effect for good or evil. It therefore follows that no one can be the same after this study as before it. All future life will be influenced by it, and even eternal destiny will be, in a measure, affected.

2. Earnest seriousness is the mental condition necessary to the reception of great truth. A frivolous mind is a shallow soil in which to deposit the seeds of truth. This law holds good in every field of knowledge. Frivolousness withers the most beautiful plants that take root in the soil of the human mind, like a frost in June withers the tender vegetation of spring.

This is peculiarly true in the study of sacred truth. Every spiritual blessing has its own condition on which it must be received. Jesus said, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Purity of heart is, therefore, the necessary condition of seeing God. "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." The exercise of mercy is the condition upon which the receiving of mercy is suspended. So here, earnest seriousness is a necessity to him who would see the higher spiritual truth. Without this the apprehension of truth is impossible in any clear and exhaustive way.

This being true, it is with a deep sense of responsibility that I approach this task, and I would have every student who may follow me in this study come

with very earnest and serious mind and reverent purpose.

The importance and dignity of Bible study appear:

I. Because the Bible is the primary text-book on God.

1. It may be said that the book of nature is a revelation of God, but it should be observed that the Bible is needed as an antecedent revelation, otherwise the book of nature may be misread or misinterpreted. It certainly is not read by all alike and by some a revelation of God in nature is denied. The one who has received a revelation of God by word may say, "The heavens declare the glory of God;" but he who rejects the revelation by word may look into the heavens and say, "There is no God." The grotesque ideas of God entertained by heathen peoples show the book of nature needs to be supplemented, or rather preceded, by an inspired word revelation.

2. Furthermore, it should be observed that in at least one respect the Bible is scientific in method; namely, it adheres to its central purpose, which is to give to man a revelation of God. Here it meets a scientific requirement.

Astronomy has its text-books; geology has its books of authority; the same is true of all the sciences. It should be noted, however, that: Works on astronomy do not deal with geology or botany. The scientific method demands that every scientific treatise shall confine itself to its peculiar domain. Books on science do not deal with God directly. To do so would be a violation of scientific principles. Some have objected to the Bible because it does not treat of scientific topics. This is an unreasonable and an

unscientific demand. The Bible confines itself to its own proper field, and in this respect it is scientific.

3. In the Bible, God reveals himself to man. We learn the attributes of God: omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, eternity, goodness and love. We learn the character of God: pure, merciful, kind, loving, longsuffering, tender, gracious. We learn the will of God: Since God is the Creator of all things, he is the proprietor of the universe and his will is supreme. The opposition of any other will to the will of God is, therefore, rebellion, and must necessarily entail direful consequences, which fact not only the Bible teaches, but all experience corroborates.

Finally, we learn the purposes of God. God's purposes are always in perfect harmony with his attributes and character. If God is omniscient, his purposes are wise; if God is loving, his purposes are beneficent; if God is righteous, his purposes are just; if God is omnipotent; his purposes will not fail of accomplishment.

4. This Bible is as much greater than any other book as the Creator is greater than the creature, the Infinite greater than the finite. A study is important in proportion to the greatness of its subject-matter, and hence Bible study necessarily occupies the supreme place.

It is strange that any one should grow impatient when studying this book. Some can devote hours every day to science, mathematics, philosophy or history, but begrudge even one hour per week to the study of God's word; and yet no hour can be so well spent if judged by the practical results growing out of it. No hour will so enrich the mind and so effectually prepare it for profitable exercise in every field of

study and investigation. Bible study is, therefore, not only profitable for its own sake, yielding as it does treasures of priceless value, but also for its beneficent effects upon the mind itself. It sobers the judgment, clarifies the reason, quickens the conscience, fortifies the will, strengthens the sensibilities, gives power of correct vision and keen perspection, and, in short, prepares the mind for its highest and best activity.

II. Because of the historic relation of the Bible to human progress and civilization.

1. Christianity exists as a mighty force; it holds under its sway the greatest nations of the earth. The measure of a nation's Christianity to-day is the measure of its civilization.

This book has more to do with shaping the destiny of nations than any other book. God's dealings with nations are here disclosed. Here we have recorded an account of the molding and modifying influences that have operated to change the great currents of the world's history. As the history of the race is here unfolded in its mighty comprehensive sweep, we are enabled to see that

". . . Behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own."

It also descends to the particular and shows us how God deals with individuals. This feature adds a peculiar value and charm. In short, it shows us the consequences of both sin and righteousness as they are revealed in the history of individuals and nations.

2. But not only does the Bible disclose the causes that operate in determining national and individual character and destiny, but it has shown itself to be the potent force that makes for progress in every field of human endeavor. Science, arts, literature, government, education, family life, all owe their progress and development to the vitalizing and stimulating influence of the Bible. Wherever this book has not gone there has been no progress during centuries and millenniums. If this statement seems to be discredited by the recent history of Japan, it is a sufficient reply to say that Japan has taken the Christian nations as her model and owes her recent progress, indirectly at least, to the same cause that has operated in the development of her sister nations that she has been wise enough to imitate, and her rulers and influential men, recognizing this fact and viewing the question from an economic standpoint, have lately been discussing the wisdom of adopting Christianity as the national religion. In short, this whole question may be briefly summed up as follows: Wherever the Bible has not gone, civilization is at its lowest point and progress is not discoverable; wherever the Bible has been taken from the people, or has fallen into disuse, a retrograde movement has set in; and wherever it has been cherished most and allowed to have its fullest effects, progress has been greatest and human conditions most beneficent.

Whence, when and how did this mighty force arise? Wherein lies its power? What is the nature of the book that has shown itself able to accomplish such prodigious effects? These are questions no educated man can afford to ignore.

III. Because of the intrinsic value of the Bible as a book of history.

1. It antedates all profane history. It takes up its record with creation, and gives us an account of the origin of the material universe, the creation of all animate forms culminating in the creation of man. Then it gives an account of the trial of human nature in the first Adam, the fall, the growth of wickedness ending in the destruction of the godless world, the preservation of a righteous line through Abel, Enoch and Noah to Abraham. Then it gives a history of the development, fates and fortunes of the chosen nation that has, perhaps, exerted a greater influence upon the world at large than any other people. It is safe to say that no more important history has ever been penned than the history of the nation that sprang from the loins of Abraham. To understand the history of Israel is to have a key to the understanding of all history. In other words, Bible history lies at the focal point of all the great historic currents.

2. It gives us the historic development of three great religions, and shows their relations to each other; the patriarchal religion, covering a period of many hundreds of years; the Jewish religion, extending over a period of 1,500 years, and Christianity, extending from the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection onward. Each dispensation is distinct, and yet all are closely related, being successive steps in a great development. Christianity is the final and complete system to which the others pointed by type and prophecy, and for which they served as a preparation in many ways. The Bible, therefore, furnishes

us the historic basis and development of the best religious system the world has seen—God's great plan of salvation complete.

3. It embraces in its scope not only man's origin, but his spiritual condition and his eternal destiny. It teaches the doctrine of man's celestial origin, declaring him to be the child of God by creation and his son by redemption. It reveals to man his condition in his unregenerate state, showing to him his sinfulness and helplessness without divine aid, and finally it discloses to him the destiny that awaits him in the land beyond the grave, giving a graphic picture of both the righteous and the wicked in the future world.

IV. Because the Bible ranks very high from a literary standpoint.

1. Viewed simply as literature, aside from its ethical and religious value, the Bible is worthy of earnest, thoughtful study. This fact is recognized by all persons of sound literary judgment and good literary taste. The best speakers and writers read and study it for the sake of its matchless style, and all who do so are marvelously influenced by such study. They show its impress both in the matter and form of their productions. One can scarcely read a page from one of the English masters without detecting the Bible influence in one form or another, and one can not listen five minutes to one of the great platform speakers of the day, whether he be discoursing on political, scientific, social, ethical or literary subjects, without discovering that he is not a stranger to the literature of the Bible, as is evidenced by both diction and moral tone.

2. As respects the style of the Biblical writers, the

greatest variety is exhibited. Some of the writers and speakers are matchless for the simplicity of their language, which is one of the highest literary qualities. Chief among these was the great Teacher himself. Nowhere is the maxim of Horace more forcibly illustrated than in his teachings. Horace said: "You who would write, do it in such a simple manner that any one might say, 'I could do that myself,' but he will labor and sweat much if he should attempt it." How strikingly true this is of the words of Christ. One can but be struck with the simple, unpretentious style of the utterances. The flow is so easy and natural that any one might hope to be able to talk in the same manner, yet who has ever been able to do it? As a matter of fact, there is no quality in style so difficult of attainment as simplicity, and this is one of the striking characteristics of much of the Biblical literature. Other portions, however, rise to the highest point of sublime rhetorical diction. In bold metaphor, apt simile, rich parable, happy illustration, it has no equal. This whole matter may be summed up in a very brief, yet comprehensive, way. The Bible contains some of the best examples of classic prose anywhere to be found—the English Bible is pre-eminently the English classic. It contains some of the most beautiful gems of poetry that have ever been produced—David and Isaiah as poets have never been excelled. It furnishes us with some of the best examples of oratorical composition to be found in any language. In many portions its eloquence is truly sublime, the rhetoric being incomparable. The finest specimens of impassioned eloquence to be found in any language are seen in the Bible. Glowing description, striking imagery, patriotic fire, fierce

invective, wailings of despair and pæans of victory, abound. In short, for classic composition the Bible stands alone and unapproachable.

V. Because the Bible is incomparable as a book of ethics.

1. Its morality is faultless when properly understood. Judge it by its practical results, which is the only fair test, and all ground of criticism vanishes. It has been charged that the Bible encourages polygamy and yet polygamy lives only in lands where the Bible has not gone, or where it has been grossly perverted by spurious additions and alterations. It has been charged that the Bible supports slavery and yet increase of Bible knowledge and the practical application of Bible principles destroy slavery in all its forms, whether it be political, industrial, or the slavery of appetite and lust. As a matter of fact, the Bible is very practical in its method of dealing with great political and social evils. While its legislation is always above the people, it is never so far above them as to make it impossible for them to reach up to it in a reasonable time, and in the meantime it simply tolerates what it necessarily takes time to cure. Therefore we say, judge it by its ultimate effects rather than by a temporary attitude during a transition period. When this is done, the critic is deprived of his weapon of attack. Even wars of extermination, which seem in some cases to have received divine sanction, can be readily defended on high moral grounds. In a time of gross and universal idolatry, when, by long practice of its hideous, immoral and grossly impure rites and ceremonies, the very moral, if not the physical, blood of the nations

was polluted by its insidious taint, and when in order to a final extermination of the world-wide contagion a standing ground had to be secured in the shape of at least one little nation that had been cured from the universal pest, extermination of peoples contiguous to this chosen nation whose influence would greatly retard if not entirely prevent the attempted cure, seems, even from the human standpoint, to have been the only remedy. Here, as elsewhere, judge the Bible by the ultimate result rather than by some temporary measure of necessity or expediency, extreme though it may have been.

2. But the comprehensiveness of ethical Bible teaching is no less wonderful than its high ethical character. The duties man owes himself are clearly defined and forcibly elaborated, and here is the logical beginning place. It is not selfishness to say that man's duties to self, in some respects, take the precedence of all other duties because he is thereby qualified for highest service to others. The sentiment that "He who is not true to self can ne'er be true to any man" states a principle universally applicable. But not only are the duties to self clearly elaborated, but the duties man owes to others are also clearly set forth. Here are prescribed the mutual duties of husband and wife, parents and children, neighbors, citizens and mankind as a whole. No relationship is overlooked.

Finally, the duties man owes to God are specifically enjoined, which are the highest of all because necessarily related to all. In brief, it is the great text-book on social, civil and religious law.

The best codes of law we have to-day are founded on the Bible.

VI. Because it is pre-eminently a modern book—a book always abreast of the age.

1. True, it is a record of events that happened hundreds of years ago, but we do wrong to place a long period between us and the Bible. It is a book of the present. It is a history of this very time. Any other view is superficial and inadequate. Here, in a certain sense, I can find my own biography written. Here are found the characters all around us. Judas, Pilate and Caiaphas, nay, more, Adam, Abel, Cain, Noah and Abraham—in short, all the Bible characters—are reproduced in the men of to-day. Though dead, they not only speak from out the pages of sacred history, but by the mouths of their living representatives.

2. Its thoughts and teachings the world has never outgrown. Its principles are as applicable now as when they were uttered. They are vital, not only in the sense of being transcendently important, but because they are as fresh as man's latest want. The solution of every problem is found as it arises. It has been said that "Whatever rules living men must be living." Hence the words of the inspired writer, "The word of God is living and powerful." The intensely modern character of this very ancient book is a most wonderfully interesting fact, and at once stamps it as a divine book. The world soon outgrows any other book except it be from purely literary considerations. All climb higher and higher on the library shelves until at last they reach the highest shelf, where they remain in undisturbed repose, but the Bible holds its place on the center table because its teachings never become effete or

obsolete. It is living, modern, up-to-date, yea, ever going before the advancing hosts of humanity and beckoning onward to ever nobler and higher ideals. One of its writers declared, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be." In similar speech we may say of the Bible, "It doth not yet appear what it shall be or what it shall teach." The doctrine will, in a very important sense, be determined by the problems that shall arise. The true preacher always has a fresh sermon albeit it is drawn from the same old arsenal of supply. It is an inexhaustible storehouse, or, to change the figure, a perennial fountain. It will never run dry. It was the book of our fathers and solved their problems. It is our book, and shows no inadequacy in meeting our burning questions, and it will be the book of our children and will meet their most insistent inquiries with satisfying power.

VII. Because it reveals God's plan of human redemption.

1. Man might have learned that he is sick, but he could not have learned the nature and consequences of his disease nor could have discovered the remedy. God's revelation comes to reveal man to himself. Jesus said, "When he [the Holy Spirit] is come he will convince the world of sin." True, in this language he referred to the specific sin of rejecting the Messiah, but back of all specific acts of sin lies the terrible fact of human depravity. Jesus taught that from within out of the heart proceed sinful acts. The Bible recognizes the fact of sin from its very beginning onward, and it gives us a very dark picture of man under its dominion. This is a necessary thing for at least two reasons: Sin is the funda-

mental malady, the fruitful source of all other evils. There is nothing that afflicts mankind, no physical malady, no adverse social or political conditions but what can be ultimately traced to the awful fact of sin. In the second place, be it observed that until this fact is recognized man will not desire an escape from the dominion of sin, and until such desire arises man will remain willingly under its power. He will hug the chain that binds him and remain a voluntary slave. Slavery that is recognized and from which the soul revolts is a truly deplorable state, but when a man loves his bondage and glories in his shame, his condition is hopeless indeed.

2. But the Bible not only reveals the fact of sin, but it also discloses the remedy. The antidote for sin is clearly pointed out, and it can be learned nowhere else. Nature has furnished no alembic to purify man from the taint of sin. All remedial schemes of man's devising have proven utterly futile. The greatest minds the world has known have expended their energies on the solution of the problem, but all in vain. The great races and nations under the tutelage of their master minds have sunk lower and lower in moral degradation and shame, even though in some cases great intellectual development was secured. Greece presents such an example, yet Grecian culture and philosophy failed to secure moral elevation and purity. The world after repeated failures became bankrupt in hope and faith, and settled down to a condition bordering on despair. The greatest minds had demonstrated their utter inability to solve the problem, when God's great remedial scheme was introduced into the world. The Bible gives a history of the development of this scheme,

beginning in the family religion of the patriarchs, and proceeding onward throughout the national religion of the Israelites, and culminating in the universal religion of Christ. In the first two sin was not actually, but only prospectively, removed, but in the latter remission was complete, which fact the prophet foretold in the language: "Their sins and their iniquities I will remember no more." This fact stands in contrast with the remembering again of sin every year under the old dispensation. The annual sacrifices of the first two were therefore not efficacious for the removal of sin, but merely prophetic and symbolic of the great and efficacious sacrifice made by Christ on Calvary. In this sacrifice we find the meritorious cause of remission of sins, the procuring cause lying in the conditions divinely imposed under the new dispensation.

VIII. Because the Bible takes a large and ennobling view of man.

1. Various standards of human greatness have been set up, such as riches, wisdom, power. By these standards human greatness is regarded simply as an accident that may or may not attach to the individual. This view of man has always tended to his debasement.

Jesus taught a very different doctrine. He said, "What would it profit if a man should gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" He might gain wealth, wisdom or power, and still have lost that which is of far greater value—the soul itself. It will at once be seen that the Bible makes human greatness an intrinsic, inherent quality. Man is great because he is man, and not by virtue of the accident

of wealth, or power, or wisdom. Furthermore, the Bible dignifies man in his origin, nature and destiny. This view of man has always tended to his elevation. It must necessarily always do so.

If man is a child of the King it behooves him to show himself worthy of his celestial origin. If he may be made partaker of the divine nature, his heart being made the abode of the divine Spirit, it behooves him to qualify himself for such heavenly fellowship. If he is destined to eternal companionship with God and celestial beings, it behooves him to prepare himself for such exalted associations.

The Bible view of man stands in direct antagonism to the view presented in materialistic philosophy. The latter regards man as having sprung from the earth and destined to return to earth again. "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust." This expresses the materialistic view of the origin and end of man. The Bible, however, begins the circle, not in earth, but in heaven; thence sweeping downward it touches earth and then circles back to heaven again. "The body returns to earth, but the spirit returns to God who gave it." The part that returns to earth is not the man, but only the tenement of clay in which the man dwells. The real man begins and ends in heaven. This, at least, is the origin of all and the end of many, and, potentially, the end of all. To fail of this attainment is to fall short of the highest possibilities.

IX. Because the Bible discloses the only practical way of teaching men.

1. Man can not learn by simple abstract statement. We must have truth in the concrete before

we comprehend it fully. The Bible is a book that presents a truth in the concrete. It shows us what sin is by giving us a view of sinful men; what righteousness is by causing righteous men to pass in review before us. More important than all, the great central figure in the Bible is a divine incarnation. God gives us an understanding of himself by incarnating himself. The doctrine of the incarnation is not only a theological, but a psychological, doctrine. It is reasonable because it is grounded in the very nature of the soul. Man is influenced first and most by the concrete presentation of truth. He reaches the abstract through the concrete. The differentiating feature of the Christian system is the fact that the personality of its Founder is the paramount question. The great question is, "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is he?" rather than, "What does he teach?" It is the former that gives importance to the latter. "His life was the light of men." This is true because man is so constituted that light is best imparted through life, which is another way of saying that man learns best through the concrete. The deepest and most lasting impressions are made by life rather than by dogma. Therefore, to preach Jesus is to preach a living, reigning person, and I may add that the next thing in order of importance is the personality of the preacher or teacher. What the teacher is is vastly more important than what the teacher knows, for no amount of knowledge can take the place of a true, forceful personality. If this principle were understood, a new standard of orthodoxy would be set up. The righteous, godly man would be the truly orthodox man, and the wicked, ungodly man would be the heterodox man. Men

who reject the doctrine of incarnation show not only their theological ignorance, but lack of psychological knowledge. They understand neither the mental peculiarities of man nor the nature of the Christian religion.

2. It follows, therefore, that, as teachers, we must observe the same great and necessary law. No man is a strong teacher who does not incarnate his teaching. He must be a concrete representation of his doctrine. His life must be the light of men. No amount of knowledge can take the place of life. He must be first a man to be a real teacher.

As Christians we must observe the same rule. Incarnate Christianity will convert the world; theoretic Christianity alone never can do so. The dogmatism of word must be accompanied by the dogmatism of action. The man who is saved, as is evidenced by his life, must present the gospel that saves, and this gospel will be a divine incarnation rather than a system composed of doctrinal tenets. In the light of these facts the meaning of Paul is clear when he says, "I determined to know nothing among you but Jesus and him crucified." I am therefore convinced that the best text-book on pedagogy is the Bible, and consequently no book is so important to the teacher as is this book.

X. Because the Bible exercises quickening and transforming power in the hearts and lives of men.

1. "The entrance of thy word giveth life" is a statement amply attested in human experience. The Bible has been the great soul quickener, which is a fact readily accounted for. The Bible is a revelation, not only from God, but of God, and no idea has

such stimulating and transforming power as the God idea. God is the needed portion of the soul and to reveal God to the soul is to satisfy its deepest yearnings. "Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth us," expresses a deep and abiding truth. The great object of the incarnation was to bring God in the fullest way within the range of the human understanding for the sake of its transforming power, hence Jesus said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

2. All true development begins with God, because there can be no true development while the heart is full of evil, and to take in God is to drive out the evil from the soul. The heart is purified by loving a pure person rather than by believing true doctrines. True doctrine is important, to be sure, but true doctrine may be, and unfortunately often is, entertained by impure minds, but when the heart lays hold of a pure person the greatest purifying and transforming power has been apprehended. No one can truly love a pure person without being made better, and to truly love the infinitely pure and holy God is to be purified in soul and made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. Hence, when Jesus was asked which was the greatest commandment, he replied, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy might and mind and strength."

XI. Because the Bible has power to sustain the soul amidst the deepest trials and afflictions of life.

1. One of the most universal experiences of life is that of sorrow. Whatever else we may or may not do, sooner or later we will all of us weep. Scotland's greatest poet well says:

"I've seen yon weary winter sun
Twice forty times return;
And every time has added proof
That man was made to mourn."

Here is the common meeting-ground of humanity. Riches, power, education, social position or many other occasions of advantage may come to some, but they are denied to many, and even the fortunate ones are not exempt from loss; sooner or later the hearts of all will be saddened by disappointment, burdened with sorrow, or wrung with anguish.

2. But we must not, therefore, imagine that sorrow is an awful disaster out of which no good can possibly come, for the Bible unites with universal experience in teaching the beneficent ministry of pain and sorrow. Unbroken prosperity often, yea, generally, produces disastrous results. The heart is made hard and selfish and cruel. Adversity is frequently the individual's best friend. Sorrow is often a blessing in disguise. As a matter of fact, the best and noblest qualities of mind and heart are developed in the school of pain and misfortune. The noblest examples of manhood and womanhood the world has known have been purified in the furnace of sorrow and affliction.

3. What man needs is not exemption from the hardness that attaches to the lot of the many, for then the conditions of the highest and best development would be taken away, but rather some stay and support when the burden seems unsupportable. Some comforting assurance, when sorrow and despair seem too great for human endurance; some sure anchor for the soul when the tumultuous billows of adversity seem ready to engulf it in hopeless destruc-

tion and ruin. The Bible is the one book that meets this great want. It teaches that all things may be made to work for good to the soul; that adversity may be made a stepping-stone by which to rise into greater and nobler life; that misfortunes may be made rounds in a golden ladder on which the individual may mount upward to ever greater and grander heights. It tells us that "our light afflictions are but for a moment," and that they "work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." There is no dungeon of sorrow too dark for it to illumine, and no prison of despair too strong for it to open. It takes away even the sting of death and robs the grave of its victory.

XII. Because the Bible is the only telescope that reveals the world beyond the grave.

1. Of all the vast unnumbered throng that have passed through the grim portal into the world that lies beyond the confines of time and sense, no voice has come back to tell us of what we so much desire to know. No traveler has ever returned to enlighten us concerning that country into which many of our friends and loved ones have already gone, and many more will soon go, and whither all of us are assuredly tending. Nature may give hints; the spring, the butterfly, the plant springing from the seed—all this may be beautifully suggestive, but it amounts to no more than a probability. Even the yearning for a future life is only a hint of what may be. Nature gives no certain answer.

2. Jesus, however, speaks with assurance. "I am the resurrection and the life." "I go to prepare a place for you," "I will come again and receive you

unto myself." He raised the dead, and finally overcame death in a personal encounter and triumphantly rose from the grave. This enables us to say, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" Here we have certainty. Here the most burning question is answered.

3. In the Book of Revelation we have a picture of man redeemed. "These which are arrayed in the white robes, who are they, and whence came they? . . . These are they which came out of great tribulation, and they washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." As this bright picture is revealed to us, we say it is enough. Nothing more is needed. The gloom of the grave is dispelled by the glorious light of immortality.

CHAPTER II.

The Bible as a Whole.

1. There must be a starting-point in every investigation. In this study of the Scriptures we begin with God for two reasons: This is the easiest beginning place. It is much easier to believe in God than to explain existing phenomena without God. It is also the most satisfactory beginning place. God is a sufficient explanation of all existing things. We do not get rid of mystery, but we practically exchange all mysteries for one mystery. Without God the simplest things in nature are mysteries; with God we have an adequate explanation of all things.*

2. The existence of God being assumed (by this we do not mean that his existence can not be proven, but that, for the present, we do not enter upon that investigation), it is antecedently probable that he has spoken to man. If God exists, he is certainly the Creator of all things, and consequently man is his creature, having powers of thought and speech. God can not be inferior to his creature, and hence he can speak. It is therefore probable that God has spoken. To deny that God has spoken, logically leads to a denial of God. Atheism is the necessary goal of all who deny the possibility of a divine revelation. The course of reasoning that leads to this conclusion is very short and simple. But three suppositions are possible: First, one may say, "God

* Parker's "People's Bible," volume on Genesis.

can speak, but will not." This, however, would be to impeach God's goodness. Man yearns for God. "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us," was the request made by Philip of his Master, and in this request he expressed a universal desire. Paul spoke of the Athenians feeling after God. All the attempts of men to bridge over the chasm between man and God give expression to this world-wide desire. If God can answer this desire and will not, his goodness stands impeached. Second, one may say, "God will speak, but can not." This it will be seen at once impeaches God's power. It makes him inferior to man, his creature. Third, one may say, "God can and will speak." This is the only alternative left, and since the other two alternatives can not be admitted, it follows that it must be true. Deny this and atheism is the only resort left. If God can and will speak, then he has spoken. If he has not spoken, then there is no God.

3. We accordingly are not surprised to find that the Bible claims divine authorship. Paul says, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." In Hebrews we read: "God having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son" Jesus said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." These quotations might be multiplied at almost any length. The Bible claims to be the word of God from beginning to end. Two facts are worthy of note just here: There is nothing in the book, when properly understood, to invalidate this claim. That is, there is no incongruity between the claim and the book itself. There is everything in the book to justify this claim. Its language, its purpose, its facts, its thought, are worthy of God.

In studying this book as a whole, let us consider:

I. The question of inspiration.

The claim of inspiration is boldly put forth by the Biblical writers, and in so doing they meet an antecedent probability and a reasonable expectation on the part of man. This leads naturally to the inquiry: What is inspiration?

Often the challenge is made by rationalists for a definition such as will cover all of the facts and not more than is warranted. Furthermore, there is a long-standing controversy between the advocates of verbal inspiration and the believers in thought inspiration, the former contending that the exact words of Scripture are dictated by the Spirit of God, while the latter contend that inspiration is a mental illumination by the Divine Spirit, supernatural in character, enabling the agent to grasp the truth to be revealed of whatever nature it may have been, whether historical, legal, didactic or prophetic, but leaving him free to express the message in his own way.

I am inclined to think that both contentions are true within certain limits. The facts as revealed in the Scriptures seem to show that certain passages are verbally inspired, while much larger portions are the result of thought inspiration or miraculous mental illumination.

I herewith submit a few definitions of inspiration, the first being the best expression which I am capable of giving of the view of Christian evolutionists, so called, and of the advocates of the divisive hypothesis, for they are practically the same, the others being definitions formulated by members of my advanced class in homiletics.

1. Inspiration is the influence upon thought and speech of the resident divine factor in man, but more especially in the Hebrew race, since there the divine factor was most pronounced or most fully developed, and consequently in that race the clearest and fullest conception of God and religion existed.

This idea makes the inspiration of the Bible the same in kind as the inspiration of any other book that might be named, the difference being one of degree merely.

2. Inspiration is the supernatural influence of the Spirit of God acting upon a writer or speaker whereby he is enabled and led to proclaim the divine message, and is so guided that substantial accuracy is assured.

3. Inspiration is the influence of the Divine Spirit upon the prophets, guiding them in giving the message of God as he wills it; whether in specified language, in thought, or in the selection of material derived from human sources.

4. Inspiration is a miraculous influence which enables men to receive divine truth, whether by direct word of God or by inward suggestion, or by ministration of angels, or by means of dreams and visions, or, as Paul says, "in divers manners," and to communicate the same.

Summary.

Inspiration, as applied to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is such a divine illumination and guidance of the mind of the chosen agent as enabled him to reveal past history otherwise unknown, to select from existing material that which is true and suited to the divine purpose in revelation, to reject from material at his command or from the facts in his

own knowledge such things as were not germane to that purpose, to stimulate memory to recall necessary truth that otherwise would have been lost, and to communicate new truth necessary for man's salvation and instruction and not discoverable by the natural unaided powers of the human mind.

Condensed Summary.

Inspiration is a special miraculous illumination and guidance of the mind of the chosen agent, enabling him to communicate the divine message, whether historical, legal, didactic or prophetic, either in words dictated by the divine person or in his own language.

In studying this book as a whole let us consider:

II. The names given to the Sacred Writings.

1. "The Bible:" This means, THE BOOK. It is the Book of books. It is not, however, a single book, but a collection of writings usually bound together in one volume. If the Bible is what it claims to be, then it is pre-eminently THE BOOK. In purpose, matter and importance, it stands alone and unapproachable.

2. 'The word of God:" So called because it contains God's word. It is a revelation of God's will. Sometimes God speaks directly to man, sometimes through men, sometimes through angels. But whether the divine communication comes direct from God or through men or through angels it is essentially the word of God. This does not mean that every word in the Bible is the word of God. We have in some instances the words of uninspired men, yea, even of very bad men, and in some instances we have the words of Satan recorded. It does mean, however, that the Bible contains the word of God, and that it reveals

God—his character, purposes and plans. Hence the designation, "The Word of God," is entirely appropriate.

3. "The Scriptures," or "The Sacred Scriptures:" The original documents from which our translations are made were written with a pen or stylus; hence they are called scriptures, from the Latin *scribo,* I write. They are called sacred because they are of divine origin.

4. "The Canon" or "Sacred Canon:" The books that are decided to be of divine origin, and hence inspired, constitute what is called the Canon. This word is used to distinguish the inspired writings from certain apocryphal writings which are not inspired, also to distinguish them from all profane or secular writings.

Other names, such as "the sacred writings," "the inspired writings," etc., are used, but all mean substantially the same as the foregoing names.

All of these names are properly used by believers in inspiration. Those who deny the inspiration of the Bible are estopped from using any of these designations. If the Bible is not the word of God, or if it does not contain the word of God in a very special sense, then it is not the Bible, or the book, but a book. It is not the word of God any more than the works of Shakespeare or Milton are the word of God. It is not the Scriptures any more than the tablets containing the cuneiform inscriptions, dug from the buried Oriental cities, are the Scriptures. It is not the canon or sacred canon, because there is no such thing as a sacred canon or list of inspired books, and all writings making such claims are a fraud and the rules by which the canon has been decided upon must manifestly be

untrustworthy. These names presuppose faith in the divinity of the Scriptures.

III. Some of the important and striking peculiarities of the Bible.

1. There is a marvelous unity notwithstanding the wonderful variety that characterizes the book. This variety is shown in two principal ways: (1) Variety in authorship. Between thirty and forty different authors have contributed to the Bible, differing in the widest possible extremes in circumstances, condition, culture, etc. Kings, emperors, princes, poets, sages, philosophers, fishermen, statesmen, herdsmen, tax-gatherers, rich men, poor men, exiles, captains, legislators and judges have all contributed words, or written portions of this book. These men were of different stations, different habits of thought and feeling, different surroundings, different education, and living in widely different ages. Each writer has maintained his own individuality and peculiarity of style. (2) Variety in subject-matter. We have in the Bible, marvelously blended, history, narrative, genealogy, ethnology, law, ethics, sanitary science, political economy, prophecy, proverbs, parables, letters, confessions, prayers, weaknesses, falls, recoveries, inward experiences, chronicles, military records, portraits of God, of angels, of good men, of bad men, visions, dreams, counsels, maxims of life, judgments of God, threatenings, punishments, sacred songs, patriotic songs, private life, social life, national life, domestic life in every station from the peasant to the king; in short, the Bible is a perfect storehouse of knowledge of almost infinite variety. Notwithstanding this, there is a substantial unity and harmony running through

the whole. It is, in fact, one book. The unity of the Bible is one of the most obvious facts connected with it. It can not be mistaken. Even the most superficial reader can scarcely fail to discóver it. One great purpose runs through it from beginning to end, and to the realization of this purpose everything is made to contribute. One great philanthropic spirit pervades the whole, and the same high moral tone runs throughout. True, the moral standard rises to higher and higher levels in the successive portions, but it is a difference in degree rather than in kind. It is such difference as is seen in the boy, the youth and the man which does not destroy the identity of the individual.

This fact of unity in such a book, composed in such a way, is sufficient to substantiate the claim of divine authorship.

2. There is an orderly development in revelation. God's message is adapted to the people and the age. In order to understand it we must know: Who speaks, to whom the language is addressed, the subject under consideration, and the circumstances calling forth the language. By taking God's dealings with men as exemplified in his laws, principles, providences and judgments, out of their proper setting as to purpose, persons, time, place, and concomitant circumstances, great injustice has been done to revelation. No other book is treated in this way by fair-minded people, and yet some who would indignantly resent the charge of unfairness do not hesitate to treat the Bible so. The gradual increase in the light shed forth, that is, in the fullness of revelation, the gradual rise in moral tone and ethical standards, the gradual unfolding of the great purpose which is but dimly fore-

shadowed in the beginning of the book, all combine to give the Bible a wonderful charm and to make it a wonderfully instructive and practical book.

3. There is remarkable accuracy of statement. All late discoveries tend to corroborate Bible statement. The errors that have been cited are chiefly verbal, and do not impair the trustworthy character of the Scriptures. It is, perhaps, perfectly safe to say that for accuracy of statement no book can be compared with the Bible. When the Encyclopedia Britannica was published the inaccuracies in American geography and topography were so abundant that it was thought necessary to publish a revised American edition. Tacitus' Germania is so full of inaccuracies that it has been held by some that Tacitus could not have been the author. The works of Herodotus, Xenophon and Cæsar are characterized by inaccuracies to a greater or less degree. Modern guide-books are nearly all faulty in their geography and topography. When all this is considered, the accuracy of Biblical statement stands as a unique and wonderful fact strongly suggestive of the inspiration of the writers; if not, certainly indicative of their very extreme carefulness.

4. The candor and truthfulness of the sacred writers is a conspicuous fact. They are true to facts, no matter who may suffer. There is no attempt to cover up the faults of the Bible heroes. In this characteristic the Bible is indeed a peculiar book. The tendency in all biographical writers is to give distorted views of their characters by omitting disagreeable facts and peculiarities and overstating the virtues, but this can not be charged against the Bible writers. The faults and foibles, yea, the glaring sins of the great Bible heroes, are made to stand out in bold re-

lief. This fact ought to give great confidence in the Biblical statements.

5. The high ethical purpose and standard is very noticeable. There is a lofty moral purpose everywhere apparent, and a majestic upward movement toward the highest standards of character. Consequently, the Bible has always been an elevating force. There is no letting down of moral standard at any point. If immoral things are recorded, it is never with approval. If wrong-doing is tolerated, it is only because the people, at a given time, are not far enough advanced for the highest standards, and the great moral principles that are enunciated finally correct the evils which may for a time have received toleration as a merely temporary policy. No man can seriously read the Bible without receiving a great moral uplift.

6. The superhuman character of many of its utterances and facts can not be successfully contested. It enters boldly the region that lies beyond the ken of human knowledge. It speaks with perfect assurance of spiritual things. Many of the facts with which it deals are clearly miraculous. The miraculous element in the Bible can not be eliminated without destroying the Book. To apologize for this element is always an evidence of weakness and lack of faith. Jesus Christ, the great central figure of the Bible, is a stupendous miracle. He is "God manifest in the flesh." This is the most satisfactory explanation that has ever been given of him. In fact, no other adequate explanation has ever been offered, and we may safely conclude that it can not be done.

Why, we may reasonably ask, can any one object to the miraculous? Atheism demands much greater

credulity than Theism. In other words, Theism is by far the easier doctrine. Let the God idea be accepted and miracle meets the natural expectation that arises. Surely he who is the author of nature can work independent of natural laws. The superhuman character of the Bible meets, therefore, a reasonable, nay, shall I not say a necessary, expectation. To me it is always a painful sight to see a professedly Christian man trying to rationalize the miracles of the Bible or explain them away. Let no one imagine that the claims of the Bible would be strengthened, or reverence for it increased, by eliminating the miraculous element. In the very nature of the case the miraculous is demanded in a book that claims to be a revelation from God. And the Bible meets this just demand.

7. The completeness of revelation is also one of its peculiarities. There is no question of the human heart that is not met and answered in the most satisfactory way; at least, no vital question. There may be questions prompted by curiosity that the Bible does not answer; but those questions that relate to human nature, human responsibility, human relationship, and human destiny, are all answered plainly and unequivocally. We feel that when the Bible has spoken, nothing more need be said. Every burning question of man has been anticipated and answered.

8. The satisfying nature of revelation is also a most gratifying, precious fact. It is wonderful how dear the Bible becomes to the earnest, faithful, prayerful student. He would give up his life before he would part with it. No other book has such a hold on the affections of man, and consequently no other book has such an influence upon the world.

9 The omissions of the Bible are significant and suggestive. Skeptics have called attention to the large breaks that are discoverable, and have cited them as objections to the book and as in a sense discrediting the idea of revelation. For instance, the life of Moses while in Egypt. The full history of the wilderness march and the history of the early life of Jesus may be cited as examples. This, however, instead of being an objection to revelation, is an evidence to the directness and singleness of purpose that is found in the volume. Nothing is introduced as a mere matter of instruction or for the gratification of curiosity, no matter how interesting such history might be. The great purpose of God moves majestically onward to its accomplishment, and whatever does not contribute to the working out of that purpose is omitted.

10. The perennial freshness of the Bible is a most wonderful fact. One would naturally think that a book that was completed eighteen hundred years ago, and that has been read and studied as no other book has been, would have lost its interest for mankind, but not so. It is alive with new interest for each succeeding generation of men. New truths are continually coming to light. New sermons shine forth from old, familiar texts for the earnest student. Surely such a book must have been written by the finger of God

11. The simplicity of the Bible combined with its sublimity is a striking peculiarity. There is a sublimity in Bible phraseology that makes it stand out as a peculiar book It has exercised great influence upon the literature of the world; whenever you hear Bible phraseology you will never be lost to recognize it. There is ever in it the majesty of God, and yet it

is so simple and direct that it appeais to the understanding of the unlettered man. It is pre-eminently the people's book because of its simplicity, and this simplicity reached its very climax in the greatest teacher that ever stood upon the earth, of whom it was said: "The common people heard him gladly."

12. The largeness everywhere seen in the Bible constitutes one of its most interesting features. There is an atmosphere of bigness that is unmistakable. It is the foe of narrowness. Its conceptions are large, its plans godlike, and its words comprehensive. "The world," "all nations," "every creature," "the whole creation," "whosoever will"—these are some of the terms and phrases that indicate the comprehensive purpose and plan of the sacred Book.

CHAPTER III.

The Bible Divided into Old and New Testaments.

The broadest analysis of the Bible results from separating it into two great divisions known respectively as "The Old Testament" and "The New Testament." Three words here stimulate inquiry: Why are these divisions called Testaments? Why is one called Old and the other New?

The answer to these questions will become very plain by an analysis, such as necessarily precedes all rational attempts to separate the Bible into logical divisions that have a basis in the subject-matter and are consequently natural and real and not artificial or mechanical, much less visionary and fanciful.

I. The meaning of the term "analysis" and the nature of the process must be clearly apprehended.

1. To give the best definition of which I am capable, I would say, "Analysis" is the resolution of anything, whether an object of the senses or a product of the intellect, into its elements or component parts. It follows from this definition that only things of composite character can be logically analyzed. For example, water, being a compound, can be separated into its elements, hydrogen and oxygen, but oxygen and hydrogen can not be analyzed. A tree, being complex, can be separated according to its physical parts

into roots, trunk, branches; or the wood might be separated into its chemical elements. An essay may be divided according to its elementary thought parts, into words, paragraphs and sentences; or it may be divided according to its larger thought parts, into introduction, argument and conclusion; or according to the manner of expression, into literal and figurative language.

It is evident, therefore, that analysis is of two kinds: physical, which is the separation of a physical object into its parts; and logical, which is a resolution in the mind of complex thought products.

2. Analysis is accomplished by a series of divisions and subdivisions made according to some principle, which serves as a wedge to divide the term or proposition. Elements and even compounds may be divided into physical parts when no particular principle is employed, but this is not analysis, properly speaking; it is simply physical division or partition. Logical analysis is a mental process. Some principle of division must be employed, and there will be as many analyses as there are different principles of division called into use. The same principle must be maintained throughout any given analysis. To change the principle would lead to incongruous and bewildering results. Mankind may be divided according to race, nationality, religion, color, condition, etc., but no two principles can be used in the same analysis without confusion. It would be illogical to say mankind is composed of Americans, Jews and white men, for the reason that a different principle is used with each division.

A perfect knowledge of any given object of sense or thought would demand that every possible logical

principle be used as a principle of division, but our investigations usually stop short of the possible limit of analysis. We continue the divisions and subdivisions until the object we have in view is attained.

3. The Bible as a book furnishes a large field for the application of this process. By its nature it is peculiarly adapted to the work of analysis. It is pre-eminently a composite book. There are many authors and many subjects. The different portions show many differences in style and literary character. Although there is one great general purpose in the whole, yet the subordinate purposes of the various books, and even of different parts of the same book, in many cases show great variety. Hence it is that Bible analysis is a very large subject. He who thoroughly masters it must necessarily become a profound Bible scholar.

Analysis as a process or method for the acquisition of knowledge is of very great value. It gives one breadth of view as well as detailed knowledge, and perhaps there is no field in which it can be applied with more beneficent results than in the field of Biblical literature. Formerly in the popular mind it was not supposed that the Bible had divisions. All parts were supposed to be of equal value, all intended for the same purpose, and consequently it was not studied as any other book, which in reality means that it was not studied at all. The thing called Bible study in many cases was a mere groping in the dark. A feeling after something that was not very clear in the mind of the searcher, without any idea as to where it might be found. Intelligent Bible analysis is, however, a very different process and leads to very different results.

It is not our purpose in this discussion to attempt anything like an exhaustive analysis of the Bible, since this is a process that may be carried to almost any length, but merely to employ those principles of analysis that will separate the Bible into its larger and more general divisions, such as will serve as a basis for more detailed analysis and closer study.

II. "Will" or "Testament" being taken as the principle of analysis, two grand divisions of the Bible are obtained.

1. A clear idea of the meaning of the word "testament" is of great importance. In many cases "will" and "testament" are used as synonyms. More critically, however, the "testament" is the formal expression of the "will." The formal expression of God's will, or the declaration of the plan or conditions on which God proposes certain blessings, is called a "testament." The word rendered "testament" is also rendered "covenant," and these are often used interchangeably without any real distinction in meaning.

Strictly speaking, the word "covenant" brings into view the conditions upon which the blessings contemplated in the "will" or "testament" may be enjoyed. These words always contemplate two parties, the one making the will and the beneficiaries of the will and in the word "covenant" especially the idea of compact or agreement is contained. That is, the beneficiaries agree to the conditions of the will. In Bible usage the contracting parties are God on the one side, and man on the other, but the covenant originates with God and is consequently a matter of grace.

2. A consideration of the number, subjects and relations of the various covenants contributes directly to an understanding of this question. Alexander Campbell remarks that "man is a covenant creature;" that "covenants have gone hand in hand with man from the beginning;" that "God's plan has been to grant to man a charter from time to time, setting forth his relation to his creature and the obligations due from man." The number of the covenants is variously given; some say, eight; some, nine; some, more. This difference arises from the fact that certain covenants are omitted by some on the ground that they are mere repetitions, and others on the ground that they are included in, or are the outgrowth of, a more comprehensive covenant.

The covenants may be enumerated as follows:

(1) The covenant with Adam, guaranteeing progeny, the means of life for man and beast, and dominion of man over the animal creation. Gen. 1:28-30: "And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb yielding seed which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth wherein there is life I have given every green herb for meat."

It will be seen that the whole animal creation is included in the blessings promised.

(2) The covenant with Noah, guaranteeing that

there should never be another universal deluge. Gen. 9:8-17: "And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, And I, behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you; and with every living creature that is with you, the fowl, the cattle, and every beast of the earth with you; of all that go out of the ark, even every beast of the earth. And I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of the flood: neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth. And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations: I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud, and I will remember my covenant, which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth."

Here again God includes the lower animal world in his promised blessings and selects the rainbow as a token of the covenant. As a matter of course, the covenant with Adam still remained in force.

(3) The covenant with Abraham concerning a fleshly posterity and pointing to a future blessing

which would come to all the families of earth. Gen. 12:1-3: "Now the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and be thou a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse: and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Gen. 15:5: "And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to tell them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be."

(4) The covenant with Abraham concerning an earthly inheritance and also repeating the covenant concerning a fleshly seed. Gen. 17:1-9: "And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram and said unto him, I am God Almighty; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. And Abram fell on his face: and God talked with him, saying, As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be the father of a multitude of nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be called Abraham; for the father of a multitude of nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy

seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. And God said unto Abraham, And as for thee, thou shalt keep my covenant, thou, and thy seed after thee throughout their generations."

(5) The covenant with Abraham concerning circumcision. Gen. 17: 10-13: "This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; every male among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of a covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male throughout your generations, he that is born in thy house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant."

It has been commonly supposed that the great purpose of this covenant was to keep the chosen nation distinct and separate by a mark in the flesh. It is claimed by some that the rite was practiced in other tribes before it was given to the Abrahamic race, then if it continued to be practiced by other peoples contemporaneously with its practice by Israel, it could scarcely be regarded as a distinctive mark. But, however this may be, it may certainly be regarded as a seal and sign of the accomplishment of the other Abrahamic covenants.

Doubtless it had also a religious import. Oehler, quoting Ewald, says: "It may be named the offering of the body. And this is carried out in a way that shall declare the propagation of the race of revelation

to be consecrated to God." It made ethical demands, binding the recipient to obedience to God and to a blameless walk, thus becoming a symbol of a purified heart.

(6) The covenant with Abraham concerning a spiritual posterity and referred to in the latter part of the covenant concerning a fleshly posterity. Gen. 22: 16-18: "And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham a second time out of heaven, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the seashore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." This covenant gives emphasis to the two former covenants and promises to bless the whole world through Abram's seed, which, according to Paul, was Jesus Christ.

(7) The covenant with Isaac, which was a repetition of the covenants with Abraham. Gen. 26: 2-5: "And the Lord appeared unto him, and said, Go not down into Egypt; dwell in the land which I shall tell thee of: sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee, and unto thy seed, I will give all these lands, and I will establish the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father; and I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these lands; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."

(8) The covenant with Jacob, a repetition of the Abrahamic covenants and also guaranteeing a special

providence. Gen. 28: 13-15: "And, behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. And, behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee whithersoever thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of."

The covenants with Isaac and Jacob are necessarily involved in the covenants with Abraham. The repetition serves to give additioinal emphasis to those covenants, thus powerfully impressing them upon Abraham's descendants.

(9) The Sinaitic covenant, which was the constitution of a temporal kingdom, the charter of the commonwealth of Israel. (Ex. 19-23.) This government was both political and ecclesiastical. Its laws were civil and religious, the latter in their nature, though not formally, being divided into moral and ceremonial. A moral law is one that is inherently right. It pertains to an act that is right in itself; that is, one that is intrinsically right. For example, the law against murder is a moral law because murder is in itself wrong, even if there were no formal law pronounced against it. A ceremonial law is a positive law; that is, its binding force lies in the authority of the lawgiver. The whole domain of law may, in fact, be divided into two parts, moral and positive.

(10) The covenant guaranteeing the office of priesthood to Aaron and his sons. Ex. 28: 1-4: "And

bring thou near unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office, even Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, Aaron's sons. And thou shalt make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, for glory and for beauty. And thou shalt speak unto all that are wise hearted, whom I have filled with the spirit of wisdom, that they make Aaron's garments to sanctify him, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office." Ex. 40: 13-15: "And thou shalt put upon Aaron the holy garments; and thou shalt anoint him, and sanctify him, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office. And thou shalt bring his sons, and put coats upon them: and thou shalt anoint them, as thou didst anoint their father, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office: and their anointing shall be to them for an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations."

(11) The covenant guaranteeing the scepter and throne to David and his seed forever. 2 Sam. 7: 8-13: "Now therefore thus shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, that thou shouldst be prince over my people, over Israel: and I have been with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies from before thee; and I will make thee a great name, like unto the name of the great ones that are in the earth. And I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in their own place, and be moved no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as at the first, and as from the day that I commanded judges to be over my people Israel;

and I will cause thee to rest from all thine enemies. Moreover the Lord telleth thee that the Lord will make thee an house. When thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever."

The last two covenants are the outgrowth of the Sinaitic covenant.

(12) The new covenant which is developed in the apostolic records, guaranteeing the blessing to all nations which was promised in one of the covenants with Abraham. This is prophesied of in Jer. 31: 31-34: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord. But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people: and they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more." Paul repeats this prophecy and applies it to the new covenant in Christ (Heb. 8: 8-13).

Treating the four covenants with Abraham as separate and distinct, we have twelve covenants in all. Leaving out of the account the two repetitions of the Abrahamic covenants made to Isaac and Jacob, and the covenant of circumcision which was a pledge simply of the fulfillment of these covenants, and also disregarding the two post-Sinaitic covenants because they are manifestly the outgrowth or elaboration of the Sinaitic covenant, we have left, the covenant with Adam, the covenant with Noah, the three covenants with Abraham, the Sinaitic covenant, and the new covenant; in all, seven. It will be seen that the others stand related to these in such a way that they can scarcely be regarded as separate covenants.

Two of these covenants surpass the others in relative dignity and importance: (1) The Sinaitic covenant, of which Moses was the mediator. To this the preceding covenants seem to lead. This covenant was really the national constitution of Israel. All preceding covenants were swallowed up in this in the sense that they depended on it for their fulfillment. (2) The new covenant of which Christ was mediator. The Sinaitic finally gave place to this. Hence Christ becomes the all in all. This covenant is the climax of God's grace and wisdom. In this is realized all spiritual blessings. The promises to Abraham are here fulfilled. The seed is Christ; the posterity, Christians. David's son and David's throne are realized in Christ the King who now occupies the throne. Thus the covenant with David is fulfilled in Christ, who was the son of David.

Paul, in referring to these two covenants, says: "In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old," and hence the phrases, "The old covenant"

and "The new covenant," are the Biblical designations of the two great covenants.

Finally there came to be an enlargement of the terms. The old and new covenants came to mean the body of the sacred writings wherein they were developed or that grew up under these covenants. The sacred writings of the Jews were called the old covenant or Old Testament; those of the apostles and their inspired contemporaries, the new covenant or New Testament, hence the two great divisions of the Bible—the Old Testament and the New Testament.

CHAPTER IV.

Divisions of the Old Testament.

1. There is nothing that contributes more to a correct understanding of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments than a proper division of these writings. Division may be made according to authorship, period, literary form, literary character, purpose of the various writers, and so forth. Some divisions are of more importance than others, but all have more or less value.

2. A failure to make a proper division according to purpose has led not only to a great waste of time in the study of the Bible, but often to the most absurd conclusions. Great violence is thus done to the word of God and great injury to the people who are thus hopelessly led astray. Many of the teachings and practices of professedly Christian churches have grown out of a failure to properly divide the Word, and are hence unwarranted. For instance, to properly discriminate between the two great covenants and the writings pertaining to each, has led to a mingling of Judaism and Christianity to the perversion of both. The legalistic character of the old covenant has thus been carried over into the new to the destruction of the distinctive character of the latter, and some of the ordinances of the new have also thus been greatly perverted.

3. A failure to properly divide according to literary character and form not only hinders a proper under-

standing of the writers, but it also prevents appreciation of the literary beauties that add such a charm to many portions. A failure to divide according to period often leads to a misunderstanding of the ethical teachings of various portions, and hence calls forth unjust criticism.

Let us now look at some of the more general divisions of the Old Testament.

I. The Old Testament may be divided very properly according to literary character.

This principle of division gives us five groups, composed respectively of the following number of books: 5, 12, 5, 5, 12.

1. The first group, known as the Pentateuch or the five books of Moses, is historical and legal. It is also called "The Law" (Torah), or "The Law of Moses," owing to the fact that it contains the legislation that God gave to Israel through Moses as a mediator. The books composing this group are Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. The word "Pentateuch" is from two Greek words, *"pente,"* five, and *"teuchos,"* book; hence the name literally means five books.

2. The second group is also historical, and, for the sake of memory, it may be subdivided as follows:

Single three: Joshua, Judges, Ruth.

Double three: 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles.

Single three: Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther.

This makes in all seventeen books of history and law.

3. The next group is composed of the wisdom and devotional books. They are: Job, Psalms,

Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Song of Solomon. Sometimes they are all grouped under the general name "wisdom books," and again they are designated by the term "devotional books." Strictly speaking, however, Psalms constitute the devotional literature proper, because they are expressive of the devotional sentiments of gratitude and adoration of man toward God. The other books of this group may with more propriety be termed wisdom books, because they are books of philosophy or wisdom. They deal with great truths and problems of life, and state rules and maxims pertaining to life and conduct. We should, perhaps, make an exception of the Song of Solomon, the real character of this book being a matter on which critics differ. According to the allegorical interpretation, it expresses the tenderness and love of God toward his elect nation. Several other theories have been propounded.

4. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel and Daniel constitute the next group. These are all prophetical books and their authors are called major prophets, not because their prophecies are more important than the writings of other prophets, but simply because they wrote more extensively. Lamentations was written by Jeremiah.

5. The last twelve books are also prophetical in character and consist of the writings of the twelve minor prophets. They are: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.

It will be seen that there are, in all, seventeen prophetical books. The separation into two groups of five and twelve is arbitrary; that is, it is not based on any difference in the general character of groups

themselves, the size of the first five books being the only ground for separating them from the other twelve. The division serves as an aid in remembering the books.

Disregarding the subdivisions of the historical and prophetical books, we have three groups, composed respectively of the following number of books: 17, 5, 17.

Another convenient division separates the Old Testament into history, law and prophecy, but the writings considered as integral books can not be so classified, since these three forms of literature appear, sometimes, in the same book, and are more or less interspersed throughout the Old Testament Scriptures.

It is highly important that every Bible student should be able to repeat the books of the Bible in order, and yet very few can do it with any readiness. This should be one of the first acquisitions of persons who wish to be intelligent in the Bible, and it can be had at such a small sacrifice of time that failure at this point is utterly without excuse. Sunday-school teachers should require every student to be able to repeat the books of both Testaments from beginning to end without mistake or hesitation.

II. The writings of the Old Testament may also be divided according to literary form.

This division is perhaps less important than the foregoing, but it is nevertheless productive of good results in the study of the Bible. The matter of a writing is of course the most essential thing, but the influence of form is by no means to be despised. The effect on the hearer or reader depends both upon what

is said and how it is said; that is both upon subject-matter and dress.

Literary form being taken as the principle of analysis, two great divisions result: prose and poetry.

1. The prose writings make up the larger part of the Scriptures. The historical books are written almost wholly in prose, and the prophetic books are largely prose, although there are poetic portions of great beauty, and prose parts are characterized by some very striking rhetorical elements, among which may be enumerated: bold metaphor, apt simile, instructive parables (although in this respect falling far below the parables of our Lord, as recorded in the New Testament), stately diction, vehement denunciation, stirring appeal and oratorical fire. There are no better specimens of impassioned eloquence to be found anywhere than many furnished us by that splendid galaxy of Hebrew prophets that have given us the last seventeen books of the Old Testament. Even in the purely historic portions the style is noted for its sterling literary qualities, such, for instance, as clearness, simplicity, brevity and naturalness. Let it not be supposed, however, that no literary faults exist. In some places there is obscureness owing generally to extreme conciceness, or to the abstruse nature of the subject-matter, and in other places prolixity, which is never a pleasing characteristic. The style of the various writers exhibits wide differences, some writings showing greater literary excellence than others. As a whole, the prose writings of the Old Testament may be compared to the current of a great river. In some portions it flows on smoothly and majestically, yet always suggestive of wonderful power; in other portions when obstructions lie in its bed it seethes and foams and boils as if moved with

an uncontrollable impatience; again, as it hurries into the swiftly descending rapids it rushes forward with irresistible force. It may be said in brief that the style of the Biblical writings varies with the writer, varies with the subject, and varies with the occasion, which is characteristic of literary style generally.

This leads me to remark that the individuality of a speaker or writer is his most valuable asset. A person, to deliver a message with power, must reveal his own personality. He must be himself. To tell anything in one's own way is better than to tell it in the style of another. God seems to have respected the individuality of his prophets and in inspiring them to speak his truth he did not in general interfere with their style of delivering the message. To have done so would have been to weaken the effect of the message. There are no doubt cases of verbal inspiration, but they are comparatively rare. For the most part the inspiration seems to have been a thought inspiration or spiritual illumination leaving the individual free in his mode of expression. There is, therefore, no one style that is abstractly the best. That style is best that best becomes the speaker, that least impairs his individuality, that savors least of the artificial.

2. Poetic composition is, however, by no means a rare thing in the Old Testament Scriptures. While not so abundant as prose, yet there is such a large volume of it that it may justly be regarded as one of the most striking features of the sacred Scriptures. Many reasons may be assigned for the poetic form of so large a portion of God's revelation. The element of beauty is never unimportant in the sight of God. God mingles the useful and beautiful everywhere in marvelous ways. The ear of corn is accompanied with beautiful tassel

and blade and silken covering. Blossom precedes fruit, and the one is not independent of the other. Find me a thing of use and I will find near by a thing of beauty; nay, is not the thing of beauty itself a thing of use, since man has an æsthetic nature that demands its appropriate food? Why, then, should not God put his message into beautiful form, and has not the very form of the message a utility in itself? God's prose and poetry are mingled in nature and in human life; why not in his revelation?

The advantages of poetic expression are many. By it the human heart is deeply stirred, and, in turn, strong feeling and deep emotion tend to express themselves in song. Witness, for example, love songs, patriotic songs, both so abundant, and the religious songs expressive of deep religious feeling that constitute one of the most prominent features of worship. Perhaps God could have appealed to no more universal instinct. The rudest savages and the most cultivated peoples are alike powerfully influenced by song, and infancy and old age are subject to its spell. Another reason that may be given for poetic expression is the fact that thought so expressed is more easily remembered. The repetition present in all poetry is an aid to memory.

There are three principal formal elements in poetry: Rhythm, rhyme and parallelism. Rhythm is repetition of similar pulses or beats, occasioned by repetition at regular intervals of similar metrical feet; rhyme is regular repetition of similar sounds, while parallelism is repetition of similar or contrasted thought. The latter is the formal element in Hebrew poetry, the former two being wanting. There is nothing more beautiful or skillful in any poetry than the use of the

parallelism that characterizes the poetry of the Bible. The synonymous, antithetic and synthetic forms are used, sometimes separately and sometimes combined in a wonderful way. The double and triple varieties, with single and divided members, are often mingled together in a way that shows the utmost skill.*

III. It will also be helpful to consider the Scripture method of division.

Here each group is named after its chief or characteristic feature. We have:

1 A threefold division as follows: (1) "The Law." This includes the five books of Moses and the following twelve historical books. God's law to Israel stands in the center. This became the civil and religious constitution of the nation. All that preceded led up to this, and all that followed was the outgrowth directly or indirectly of this. (2) "The Prophets." This includes the seventeen books of the major and minor prophets. Predictive prophecy is a characteristic feature of these books. (3) "The Psalms." This division includes the wisdom and devotional books, and, with the exception of Ecclesiastes, is poetic in form.

2. We also have a twofold division called "Moses and the Prophets." Jesus used this division, and in its common acceptation it comprehended the entire Old Testament Scriptures.

It is well to keep in mind that poetry is not confined to the poetic books, but is more or less intermingled with the prose in all portions of the Old Testament, and especially in the prophetical writings;

*For a fuller discussion of Hebrew poetry see chapter on "Prophecy: Its Poetic Form," in my work entitled "Hebrew Prophecy."

also that predictive prophecy is not strictly confined to the prophetical books. It is also found in the historical books and in the Psalms. Prophecy in its broadest sense includes God's communications to man through both men and angels, whether the messages pertained to past, present or future. It should also be observed that Lamentations may be classed among the prophetical books because written by Jeremiah, or among the devotional books because of its character, or among the poetical books because of its form.

IV. The division of the Old Testament by books is worthy of brief notice.

The books are not accidental divisions, but are the products of authors that wrote under divine directions and restrictions, each performing an allotted task in the separate books produced. Later in this volume, and in a subsequent volume, the books will be taken up and discussed more at length. For the present we will consider the meaning of the names given to the different books, stating the reasons for the names and thus incidentally bringing to view the character of the books.

1. Genesis: The book of generations. The name was first applied in the Septuagint, a Greek version of the Old Testament, made about 280 B. C. It is a Greek word meaning origin, generation or creation. The book was probably called Genesis because it contained the genealogy of the patriarchs from Adam to the sons of Jacob. It is really a book of beginnings. We have an account of the beginning of the creation, the beginning of vegetable life, the beginning of animal life, the beginning of humanity, the beginning of family life, the beginning of probation, the beginning of sin, the beginning of fear, the beginning of sacrifice,

the beginning of punishment, the beginning of death, the beginning of redemption and the beginning of judgment.

2. Exodus: From the Greek *exodus*, a going out. It describes the going out, or the departure of the Israelites from the Egytian bondage, under Moses as leader.

3. Leviticus: So called because it contained the laws and regulations pertaining to Levites, who were the descendants of Levi and constituted the priestly tribe among the Israelites.

4. Numbers: Named from the numbering of the children of Israel, of which it gives an account

5. Deuteronomy: From the Greek words *deuteros*, second, and *nomos*, law. It means a second law, and was so called because it contains a repetition of the law of Moses, with some additions.

6. Joshua: Called after Joshua, the successor of Moses, either because he was regarded as the author, or because it gives an account of the wars of the Israelites in the subjugation of Canaan, in which Joshua was commander.

7. Judges: So called because it gives a history of Israel during the time it was ruled by judges.

8. Ruth: Called after Ruth, a Moabitish woman, who became the wife of Boaz. She was an ancestress of David and Christ. The book is largely occupied with her history.

9 and 10. 1 and 2 Samuel: These books were not separated originally, but constituted one book called Samuel, because it treats of the birth and life of Samuel.

11 and 12. 1 and 2 Kings: Originally one book. It received its name from the fact that it deals with

the history of Israel under the kings. The Books of Samuel and Kings have the appearance of being but one book. 1 and 2 Kings have sometimes been called the third and fourth Books of Kings.

13 and 14. 1 and 2 Chronicles: So called because they are the chronicles or histories made as a sort of supplement to the Book of Kings. Originally 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah were included in one book. Subsequently, in the Hebrew Canon, Ezra and Nehemiah formed one book, but they were separated in the Septuagint.

15. Ezra: Named from Ezra, its author. It is really a continuation of Chronicles, and Ezra is probably the author of both. There may be portions of these books written by some other hand.

16. Nehemiah: Called from Nehemiah, who wrote the greater part of the book. It is the latest of all the historical books of the Old Testament.

17. Esther: Called from Esther, a Jewish woman who became the wife of Ahasuerus, king of Persia. The book is, in a measure, occupied with her history.

18. Job: Called from Job, the hero of the story. It is a poem, based no doubt on real history. It partakes of the nature of an epic.

19. Psalms: So called because the book consists of psalms or songs. It is the hymn-book of the Jewish church. When arranged for the services of the church, it is sometimes called the Psalter.

20. Proverbs: So called because the book consists, in a large measure, of short, pithy sayings or provérbs —truths uttered in a short, striking form. Solomon is probably the author of the greater portion of the book.

21. Ecclesiastes: Called from the name by which

the author calls himself. It is generally conceded to mean one who speaks in a public assembly.

22. Song of Solomon: Its authorship is ascribed to Solomon, hence the name. It is also called Canticles.

23 to 39. The seventeen prophetic books are all named, with a single exception, for the prophets who wrote them. Lamentations receives its name from its character. It is a book of lamentations. Jeremiah pours out his sorrows and lamentations over the sins and sad fate of his nation.

V. A division very useful in coming to an intelligent understanding of the Old Testament Scriptures results from making purpose the principle of analysis.

This principle is capable of extensive application. Not only may each book be thus separated out and shown to have a design in some respects different from any other book, but the separate books may each be subdivided into parts which reveal different subordinate purposes. For the present we will consider the larger sections, each composed of several books and each disclosing a separate design, which, however, is closely related to the purposes of the other sections and to the design of the Old Testament as a whole.

1. First in order is the Pentateuch. Not simply first in order of arrangement in the Canon, but first because of its fundamental nature as related to the whole. The law of Moses is the great central feature of this division. To give a history of the development of the chosen nation and of the promulgation of the law of Moses as the national constitution is the great purpose of the Pentateuch, briefly stated. The ancestral line of the fathers of the elect nation is traced from the beginning and God's providential dealings

with them is shown. The history is then sketched from Abraham through Isaac and Jacob to his twelve sons, who take up their abode in Egypt, and then rapidly multiply and become a great host. Then follows an account of the deliverance and the wilderness life of forty years during which the law was given, elaborated, supplemented and finally repeated to a new generation who constituted a nation with a divinely given civil and religious polity, fit to assume the responsibilities of national life and hence ready for their promised inheritance.

2. Next in order come the twelve historical books. The general purpose of this division is the giving of the history of the conquest of Canaan and the expansion and application of God's law to national life during its gradual unfolding until it reached its fullest development under David and Solomon, and even during the decadence that set in upon the revolt of Jeroboam.

3. Then come the wisdom and devotional books, which give us an understanding of the subjective application of the law, or its appropriation by, and application to, individual life. The peculiarity of this section is its subjective character. The religion is not outward and formal, but inward and emotional. It is not religion as a national institution, but as a personal possession.

4. Finally come the seventeen prophetical books. While each book has a specific purpose, some prophets being sent to the northern and some to the southern kingdom; some being prophets of the exile, and some of the restoration, yet a general purpose runs through all. It may be described as an effort on the part of the prophets to teach the law and bring the people to its enforcement. It is the calling of the people back from

their apostasies to fidelity to God and to the faithful keeping of his law.

As a summary, I copy the words of Prof. W. H. Green ("Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch," p. 9):

"It [the Old Testament] consists of four parts, viz.:

"(1) The Pentateuch or law of Moses, the basis of the whole.

"(2) Its providential expansion and application to national life in the historical books.

"(3) Its subjective expansion and appropriation to individual life in the poetical books.

"(4) Its objective expansion and enforcement in the prophetical books."

Let it be observed, in conclusion, that aside from the purposes of the separate sections which have been just set forth, there is one great underlying, all-pervading purpose running through the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures. It may be expressed in one word, *Jesus*. It all points to him, prepares for him and leads to him. Cast him aside, and the tabernacle becomes a "butcher shop," as a noted skeptic once said. Without Jesus, the religion of the Old Testament becomes an enigma, a hull without a kernel, a form without a substance. It may be said we would have God left, but I answer no, not in any complete or satisfying sense. The Old Testament is not so much a revelation of God as a preparation for a revelation of God. Or if it be insisted that it is a revelation of God, still it certainly must be conceded that it is incomplete. In Jesus we have the full revelation. "He was God manifest in the flesh." He was "the effulgence of his glory and the express image of his substance." Therefore Jesus said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." The great purpose of the Old Testament, therefore, is a preparation for Christ.

CHAPTER V.

Periods of Old Testament Literature.

The writings of the Old Testament may very properly be grouped into five distinct and clearly marked periods.

Each group has certain peculiarities and characteristics by which it is distinguished. The consecutive groups, however, are not separated by any considerable intervals of time. Chronologically they shade into each other very closely.

We will now direct your attention to:

I. The first period, known as the Oral Period.

1. The time covered by this period extended from the earliest ages, or the beginning of humanity, down to the exodus of Israel, usually said to be twenty-five hundred years, but probably much longer. During this time the divine revelation and the important historical events may have been transmitted in part by tradition, but doubtless documents and records more or less numerous existed. Evidence of such is found in the earlier Scriptures. The partition hypothesis of the so-called higher critics requires in its simplest form at least two documents, known as the Elohistic and Jehovistic, Elohim being the name applied to the Deity in one document and Jehovah being the name used in the other. This hypothesis has taken on different forms at different times, some requiring, not two

documents, but many. According to this hypothesis, the Pentateuch is a sort of mosaic or patchwork made up by piecing together scraps from these hypothetical documents, and by supplementary portions supplied by various editors and debaters. It is hard to understand how such a work as the Pentateuch, being a connected narrative, consistent and orderly, having a distinct plan that is steadily adhered to—in other words, having a unity that is unmistakable—could have been produced in the manner suggested. We will not, however, in this place enter into this discussion. We refer the reader to Prof. W. H. Green's article on "The Unity of the Pentateuch" in his work entitled the "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch," and to his work on "The Unity of Genesis." In our next chapter we will discuss the authorship of the Pentateuch.

To admit the possibility of pre-existing documents, which may have been used by the author of the Pentateuch, does not, by any means, require us to accept the partition hypothesis in any of its forms. From whatever sources the author of the Pentateuch may have obtained his material, whether from tradition, pre-existing documents, or immediate divine revelation, if he used his material as any first-class writer of history uses the material at his command, he may justly be regarded as the author of the Pentateuch; that is, he arranges his material after his own plan and presents it from his own viewpoint and is dominated by a definite purpose. A work produced in this way is a very different thing from a mosaic made up from various documents or records patched together. The former would have a distinct unity, while the latter could not have. In any case the ques-

tion of the inspiration of the writer is an important factor in the problems with all reverent students.

During this time the patriarchal form of government prevailed. The head of the family embodied in himself the three great offices of prophet (the one who spoke God's message), priest (religious functionary) and king (ruler). Man's three fundamental soul wants are instruction, fellowship with God, which involves pardon, and government. These are supplied in the offices of prophet, priest and king. In a simple form of society the functions can be performed by one man.

2. The grounds for confidence in the authenticity of the history of this period are ample. Tradition is not wholly void of historic value. Facts, although somewhat corrupted and distorted, may in their essential features be long preserved in the form of traditions. Much of the folk-lore that exists in traditional form has as much basis in fact as written history, and it is generally not hard to eliminate the purely fanciful from the real in this class of history.

3. During this period conditions were very favorable for the traditional form of history. (1) Adam was 687 years old when Methuselah was born, and consequently lived contemporary with him for 243 years. (2) Methuselah was 369 years old when Noah was born, and consequently he and Noah lived as contemporaries for 600 years. Methuselah lived contemporaneously with Shem for 99 years. (3) Shem was 454 years old when Abraham was born, and consequently he lived contemporary with him for 146 years and with Isaac for forty-six years. (4) Isaac was fifty-nine years old when Jacob was born, and consequently he lived contemporary with him for 121 years and could have known all of his children.

Thus it will be seen that a chain of four persons covers a period of over two thousand years—Adam, Methuselah, Shem and Isaac. Joseph and one of his sons added to this list would transmit the history to Moses.

In a general way we may conclude that the longevity of the patriarchs was very favorable to the traditional form of history, even if the commonly accepted chronology be rejected.

It will readily be seen that a period of oral history necessarily precedes a written period. Writing is an accomplishment that does not belong to the infancy of nations. Children learn to talk before they learn to read and write. So of nations. Primitive nations transmit their history from father to son by word of mouth before they commit it to writing.

When written history first appears it is more or less fragmentary, as we would naturally expect, but at last an orderly connected history appears as the final stage in a natural development. If this history has unity, it is not a piece of patchwork made up of scraps from the earlier fragmentary history, but is the product of a mind that has set for itself a definite task and is moved by a definite purpose, and that consequently uses its material so as to show the impress of the author's own thoughts, plans and purposes.

Allow to the writer an inspiration enabling him to separate the true from the false, and all difficulties concerning the traditional form of history vanish.

II. We next come to the Mosaic Period.

1. This is a period of orderly connected written history as distinguished from the previous period in which the history was either oral or written in fragmentary form, or both.

This period was quite brief, covering not more than 100 years, from about 1500 to 1400 B. C.

The materials of the writings were probably derived from four sources: tradition; ancient documents consisting probably of notes and memoranda, and possibly somewhat connected and consecutive annals preserved in some family line; direct divine revelation supplementary to these two forms of history, and personal knowledge of the writer of many of the events that he records.

2. Those who believe in the inspiration of the writer of the Pentateuch hold that he was divinely inspired to record such facts as were demanded by the plan and purpose of his writing, but were not obtainable from any other source, and that he was divinely directed in the choice of other material, whether obtained from oral tradition or pre-existing written documents. It may be asked, Why use pre-existing documents or oral tradition if the author was divinely inspired? The answer is that God is an economist. He never employs superfluous agencies. The divine assistance seems to be everywhere supplementary. This lesson is taught both in the natural world and in the Bible. God never does for a man what he can do for himself. If this principle is a universal one, and I know of no exception, we would expect, in a matter of this kind, that God would leave the author to exhaust all the natural resources at his command before lending him special divine aid. The author of the Pentateuch would only need supplementary information as to matters lying outside of the ordinary sources of knowledge and infallible direction in making choice of material within his reach.

3. One other fact should be kept in mind. The

literature of the period is both considerable in volume and excellent in literary quality. Such a fact may be accounted for in either of two ways: It may have been a growth having roots or beginnings running back perhaps hundreds of years, or the form may have been the result of direct inspiration. Since God has generally respected the individuality of his prophets, leaving them free to express the divine communication in their own way, we may safely conclude that the literary form of the Pentateuch is the result of a natural growth or development. It is also a well-established fact that the art of writing is much older than the age of Moses, and there may have been an amount of pre-Mosaic literature much larger than was formerly generally supposed. In fact, Oriental research has made it certain that Moses lived in a literary age, so to speak. The argument formerly relied upon by the opponents of the Bible was the alleged fact that the art of writing was much younger than Moses, and that consequently Moses could not have written the Pentateuch. Recent discoveries have completely set this argument aside.

III. The Davidic Period or the Golden Age.

1. The time covered by the literature of this period extends from about 1100 to 950 B. C. There is evidently quite a break between the literature of the Mosaic period and that of the Davidic period. About three hundred years intervened during which time comparatively little writing was done, or, if writing flourished, very little has been preserved to us, which is not probable. The reason for this is not hard to discover. The Israelites were passing through a pioneer period and had to develop their country—

build homes and cities, improve their farms, develop industries; in short, do the work incident to a pioneer age which is never favorable to the production of a literature. Then, too, they were seldom at peace. They were harassed and vexed by enemies without and even within. Literature never flourishes during the early history of a country, or in a time of war and commotion. Another fact should be kept in mind: Only a few generations lay between the people of this intermediate military period and Egyptian bondage. It would necessarily require a considerable period of culture and training to produce a class sufficiently educated to become writers. The writing of the Mosaic period was done principally by one man who had enjoyed special educational advantages in Egypt. It necessarily took time for conditions to mature that made literature a possibility, to any considerable extent.

2. But the time arrived for the further development of the national literature.

Politically, the golden age of the nation had come. The promise that God made to Abraham centuries before concerning the land was realized under David and Solomon. The nation controlled the country from the Euphrates on the north to Egypt on the south, in area about 60,000 square miles. The enemies of the nation had been overcome and the people enjoyed peace and plenty. Such a period is always favorable to the growth of literature. Hence, as we would naturally expect, the golden age of Hebrew literature was ushered in. The writings of this period sustain a relation to the national literature similar to that which the writings of the Elizabethan age sustain to the literature of the English nation.

3. The literature of the Mosaic age is the necessary background for this literature.

National literature has its infancy, its period of greatest development, and its decay. At least, this rule seems to hold good in the history of all the nations of the past that have produced literatures. In other words, every national literature has had its golden age. It was so in Greece and Rome, and the rule has held good among modern nations. This golden age has had roots running back sometimes for centuries. Out of small beginnings great things have come by a gradual process of growth or development. The golden age of English literature—that splendid outburst of the sixteenth century to which Lilly, Bacon, Hooker, Spenser, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, and a host of others, contributed—has roots running back more than eight hundred years, to Cædmon in poetry and to Bæda in prose. Thence onward through Ælfred, Gower, Mandeville, Wyclif and Chaucer the stream of literature (to change the figure) flows with constantly increasing volume until the majestic current of the Elizabethan age is reached.

The question arises (and it is a highly important and interesting one), Where are the roots of the golden age of Hebrew literature? There can be but one answer. The Pentateuch is the natural and necessary background. Without this, the literature of the Davidic age is a great tree without roots, a mighty stream without source or tributaries. Here, to our mind, is a strong argument in favor of the early date of the Pentateuch. The only way to avoid its force is to make practically all the literature of Israel post-exilic, which leaves Israel without a literature for a thousand years of its history, except a few hypo-

thetical documents no trace of which exists outside of the supposed indications in the Pentateuch.

To carry nearly the entire bulk of the Pentateuchal literature forward to the time of Josiah and afterward, destroys anything like a rational and orderly development; it presents a phenomenon witnessed in no other national literature.

IV. The Prophetic Period.

1. There has always been a peculiar fascination about the prophetic literature of the Old Testament. This is accounted for in several ways. The predictive feature is very interesting, embodying, as it does very forcibly, the fact of inspiration. Many of the events foretold are of thrilling interest and of far-reaching importance. The language is often very beautiful, abounding in striking similes and bold metaphors, and the diction is frequently most sublime. The prophets themselves are striking and interesting characters, looming above the common level, both in moral grandeur and intellectual elevation, like lofty mountain peaks above the plain. They appear as mighty reformers raised up by God for special exigencies.

2. It must not be supposed, however, that the predicting of future events exhausted the function of the prophets. Exhortations, warnings, threatenings, promises, prayers, songs of victory, in short, persuasion in almost every form, abounds.

3. The time covered by the prophetic writing was about three hundred years, from 950 to 550 B. C. By this it is not meant that all prophecies fall within this period. On the contrary, the prophetic element enters more or less into nearly all of the Old Testament literature. It means that the wonderful galaxy of

reformers known as prophets wrote within the period named, with few exceptions.

4. The conditions that gave birth to the prophetic writings were peculiar. There was a widespread apostasy in the nation. The two kingdoms, Israel and Judah, were declining in power. The hope of empire was weakening. Through foreign alliances idolatry was creeping in.

5. A study of the prophetic writings reveals a two-fold purpose. First of all, the prophets spoke to the people of their own time. The messages were called forth by existing evils, at least in part. In other words, there was a historic background for the prophecies uttered from time to time. Even much of the predictive prophecy was hortatory in purpose, and hence conditional. If the warning was heeded, the prophecy was not fulfilled. In the second place, there was a Messianic vein running through all that is intensely interesting and highly important. As to whether the prophets themselves comprehended the import of their Messianic utterances may be seriously doubted. It is perhaps safe to say they did not in any true sense. Their views of the Messiah were not only meager, but probably grossly at fault, as were the views of the Jews in later ages. A somewhat more exhaustive analysis of the purpose of the prophecy to the Israelites may be stated thus:

(1) To give instruction. This is always characteristic of the divine dealing. God always seeks to enlighten and instruct. (2) To restore a neglected law. (3) To rebuke sin. (4) To declare God's judgments. (5) To unfold God's pardoning mercy to the penitent. (6) To foretell the coming Messianic King and kingdom, and to give a graphic representation of

both. (7) To teach new and higher conceptions of Jehovah. An interesting question takes rise at this point: Were the prophets engaged solely in an effort to cure apostasy, that is, call the people back to a neglected law, or were they seeking to do constructive work, that is, lift the people up to new and higher conceptions of God? I think both views can be maintained, and hence I think both are correct. I see nothing in one that is incompatible with the other.

There was doubtless a general purpose to the world at large which may be thus summarized: (1) To kindle spiritual aspirations. (2) To foretell the coming Saviour—his work, character and kingdom, and thus in a measure prepare the way for him. (3) To furnish a strong line of evidence for the inspiration of the Scriptures and the divinity of Christ.

6. The relations of the prophetic writings to the other Scriptures should not be overlooked. It is the very heart of the Old Testament history. Much of God's dealings with the Jews would be wholly unintelligible without the prophecies. It throws over the whole volume an atmosphere of serious truthfulness that is most charming. It has close relations to the literature pertaining to the priestly office and to the general history of the nation. It presents the objective expansion and enforcement of the law, and hence it is the necessary sequel to the legislative and historical books.

7. The style of the prophetic writings may be described as: (1) Vigorous—tropes, similes, metaphors abound; (2) poetic—some of the finest poetry extant is found in the writings of Hebrew prophets; (3) vague—this grows partly out of the fact that the language is often highly figurative. Doubtless the mean-

ing was sometimes purposely concealed, intended only to be understood when fulfilled. Predictive prophecy given for the purpose of evidence usually has its meaning veiled until after its fulfillment, when it becomes plain.

As a matter of course, each prophet has his own characteristic style, the foregoing qualities being the general or prevailing characteristics. There is, however, a similarity in style that is noticeable. There is a certain stateliness of diction and sublimity of thought and expression common to all. The same high moral tone pervades the writings of all. All consider moral questions from the same viewpoint. Loyalty to Jehovah characterizes the entire group.

8. The relation of prophet to priest and king at various times, as it is set forth in Old Testament history, constitutes a very interesting study. These three offices are co-ordinate, and between them a proper equilibrium should be maintained in order to the proper discharge of the duties belonging to each. There should be no rivalry or jealousy, or encroachment of one upon the other. Each does a work necessary to the public weal, but very different in character. Man needs instruction concerning matters undiscoverable by the unaided human mind; that is to say, revelation. This is the function of the prophet. He is God's *nabi* or mouthpiece. Man needs pardon, reconciliation with God; this is the function of the priest. Man needs rule or government; this is the function of the king. In Israel, as is always the case when the human factor enters in, there was more or less departure from the divine ideal. The proper adjustment between these three great offices was not always maintained. In the time of Samuel the influ-

ence of the prophet was supreme. Even the king was in a degree subordinate to the prophet, and did not hesitate to cultivate his society for the sake of the prestige he might thereby acquire. In the time of David the prophet and king were pretty evenly balanced in prestige and power with the people, but later on the monarchy encroached upon prophetism, and, in fact, king and priest seemed to make common cause against prophet. After the revolt of Jeroboam, prophets in the northern kingdom co-operated with the monarchy, and occupied a place of influence and power, while in the southern kingdom priesthood and monarchy seemed to combine to the overthrow of prophetism. For two and a half centuries there was little or no prophecy in the southern kingdom. In explanation of the fact that prophetism flourished in the northern kingdom and seemed to be absent from the southern kingdom, it may, as I think, be justly said that apostasy was greatest in the north, and hence God's messengers of warning were more needed there.

9. There are some points of special interest and importance relating to the prophetic books to which I wish to call attention before taking up the next period.

(1) There is never any contradiction. If different prophets prophesy concerning the same events, which they sometimes do, there is never any disagreement. This can only be accounted for on the supposition that all were guided by the same mind, or, in other words, upon the hypothesis of inspiration.

The same high ethical standard and lofty morality pervades the whole. The prophets themselves were men of sterling integrity and great purity of life, and their writings are all characterized by the same high

moral tone. Virtue and righteousness are uniformly exalted and magnified, and wickedness is condemned.

The Messianic idea enters largely into these writings. By this hope all were inspired. This thought was potent to fire their souls as no other thought, and to call forth their sublimest and most thrilling utterances. Nor is this idea confined to the prophets. On the contrary, it pervades the whole of the Old Testament literature. There are abundant references to the coming Messiah and the glory and extent of his kingdom. Can any one ask for stronger evidence of one guiding, controlling master mind?

(2) The credibility that necessarily attaches to the prophetic writings is very interesting. This is shown, by the high moral tone of the books, by the sterling character of the prophets and the evident spirit of honesty and candor, and by the minuteness of detail in which the writers often indulge.

The objector says, "It requires no inspiration to foretell future events, as, for instance, the overthrow of a city in an age of violence when such things were the rule and not the exception." How little weight this has is seen when we consider that the prophets not only foretold great calamities about to follow, but gave the minute details and made numerous specifications, all of which were rigidly fulfilled. The effort to show that there is no such thing as specific prophecy may be set down as an utter failure. The seventy weeks (or four hundred and ninety years) of Daniel, during which the special privileges of his nation were to continue, and the minute specifications of the last week of the seventy pertaining to the personal work of the Messiah—the specifications concerning the overthrow of Nineveh, Babylon and

many other cities—make impossible the theory that all prophecy is merely shrewd human prediction based on wide induction and a clear understanding of the principles of the divine government. There is such a thing as prescience or human foresight that does not involve inspiration, but many of the Hebrew prophecies are too minute and circumstantial to be accounted for in that way. Leaving out of the account all other prophecies, the Messianic predictions alone are so minute and specific as to preclude the possibility of their being the product of ordinary or even extraordinary human forecast. They must be regarded as the product of the Divine Spirit.

(3) The intense patriotism of the prophets as a whole is remarkable. The patriotic spirit is most remarkable. Not a single exception is found. Patriotic expressions are very abundant and the general spirit of the books expresses the sentiment even more forcibly than specific words could do. This, it may be remarked, is always characteristic of the truly noble man. The man who loves not his country has certainly a great grievance, or he is an ignoble soul.

> "Lives there a man with soul so dead
> Who never to himself has said,
> 'This is my own, my native land'?"

V. The Period of Restoration.

1. The time covered by this period was about 130 years—from 530 to 400 B. C. It was the period of the re-establishment of the nation in Palestine after the return from the Babylonish captivity, and was consequently ill suited to the production of a literature, being practically an infantile age in the national life. Although the nation was old and had had a long and

wonderful history and a still more wonderful literature, yet the captivity was such a complete breaking up of the national life that the period immediately following the return resembled in all respects the establishment of a new nation. Homes had to be rebuilt, cities founded, and the country reclaimed from its devastated and decaying condition. It must necessarily have been a period of privation and arduous toil, and therefore wholly unfavorable to learning and literature.

2. The quarrel with the Samaritans and its results should not escape attention. In 534 B. C., two years after the return from bondage, the second temple was commenced. The Jews refused the help offered by the Samaritans, and consequently incurred their hostility. Smarting under the insult, the Samaritans succeeded in inducing the Persian king to prohibit the Jews from proceeding further with the enterprise undertaken. The work thus interrupted was not resumed until 520 B. C., and the temple was not completed until about 516 B. C. Jeremiah had predicted that the captivity would last seventy years. Prideaux dates the beginning of the captivity at 606 B. C. The captivity did not all take place at one time. There were successive deportations, and it is probable that certain ones were carried captive at this time, which may therefore be properly regarded as the beginning of the captivity. The seventy years expired 536 B. C., which is the date of the return. Others date the beginning of the captivity in 586 B. C., when the city and temple were destroyed. Seventy years from that date brings us to 516 B. C., which was the time the second temple was completed, which may be regarded as the complete re-establishment of the nation. The former view is prob-

ably the correct one, or we may regard the first period as the captivity in the civil sense, and the latter period as the captivity in the ecclesiastical sense. The point of special significance in this connection is the fact that after the rebuilding of the second temple had been commenced, the work was interrupted for a period of years. This fact has a special bearing on the question of the literature of the period, as will appear below.

3. Four books are assigned to this period: Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther. The purposes of these books will be noticed in a subsequent volume. The language of all the writings produced after the exile is somewhat impure. Foreign words which crept into the Hebrew during the exile frequently appear.

VI. The Period of Arrangement: 400-150 B. C.

1. The Book of Esther closed the canon. Following this came the work of editing and arranging by Ezra. That Ezra was well qualified for the work of editing and arranging the canon can not be doubted. Certainly no one was more zealous for the law than he, and no one aroused more interest in the Hebrew Scriptures. He was the originator of the synagogue as a means of teaching the law. Tradition, with apparent good reason, assigns to him the work of collecting, settling and arranging the canon. His zeal for the law, his acquaintance with the Scriptures, and his prominence as a teacher of the law, give him a place second only to Moses, and by some of the divisive school of critics he is accredited with the authorship of a large share of the Pentateuch. I regard this view as extreme and unwarranted, but he may safely be regarded as the author of the canon.

2. The work of Nehemiah. The patriotism and zeal of Nehemiah are conspicuous, as is also his sterling character in other respects. Being in part contemporary with Ezra, he could have rendered him material help in the work of arranging the canon. The tradition that he formed a library of at least part of the recognized books is not at all improbable, although his labors were devoted more to the civil affairs of the nation than to the religious. His work and that of Ezra were consequently complementary, the former pertaining largely to civil matters, the latter more to priestly functions. The close relation of the civil and religious elements in the Jewish state makes it probable that he had a hand in the work of arrangement.

3. The final work. Under the Maccabæan princes the work of revision was taken up and completed. From that time the Old Testament appears in its present form. The present catalogue of Old Testament books is substantially the same as the one found in the Septuagint, except that the Septuagint contained a number of Apochryphal books. This translation was probably not all made at one time. It was begun about 280 B. C. Some argue that portions of the work were done as late as 150 B. C. Certainly from that date onward there was no material change.

VII. The Apocrypha.

In addition to the canonical books of the Old Testament, a considerable number of books and writings appeared (in all about sixteen) that have been grouped under the head "Apochrypha." These are of obscure origin; and, while they have a certain historic value, they in no respect compare favorably with the canonical books. As compared with the accepted

books, they are light and frivolous. In the early, uncritical ages, it is true that some of them were included among the canonical books, but no one can read them without feeling their immense inferiority in every respect. Owing to their character, if for no other reason, they can never hold a place in the canon.

Conclusion: It may safely be said that no nation ever produced so wonderful a literature as the Hebrew nation. It has elements that are unique and peculiar, causing it to stand out separate and distinct from all the literatures of the world; and it is a remarkable fact that the higher the culture of men is, the more it is appreciated by them. Of almost every high form of literary composition it furnishes examples of marvelous beauty.

PART II.

The Authorship of the Pentateuch

CHAPTER VI.

The Authorship of the Pentateuch—Preliminary Matters.

Before taking up the question of authorship of the Pentateuch, there are certain preliminary questions to be considered that lay the foundation for the discussion.

I wish first to consider:

I. A so-called method of study.

1. I would preface this article with the remark that there is a true science of higher criticism—that is, an inquiry into the date and authorship of documents and kindred questions—that is perfectly legitimate. I use the phrase, however, to indicate the divisive hypothesis which has monopolized the term in the minds of many. That there are many who are inclined to look upon the so-called higher criticism as something that is very innocent in its nature is very evident. The idea is ridiculed that there is anything dangerous to Christian faith in the tendencies or results of this theory. We are told that it is a method of study or investigation, and not something that has to do with individual or collective religious life; that it is not intended to make converts or develop Christian character, but that it is merely a method of investigation to be used by the minister in the quiet of his study, and consequently something entirely harmless; that it

is a literary question merely and has no religious bearing. The question is asked: Does any theory as to the origin or authorship of the Scriptures destroy their sublime and lofty character, their high ethical teaching, or their religious value? We may also state it this way: Can any theory as to the origin of the Scriptures destroy their intrinsic worth? Are not the Scriptures their own defense, regardless of the date or authorship of the various books? In proof of the innocent character of this method of study, the fact is cited that devout believers in Christianity and the inspiration of the Scriptures, such as Professors Driver, Robertson Smith and others, to say nothing of some of our own pious and devoted scholars, accept these methods apparently without damage to their own faith or detriment to their religious life. Concerning the latter point, the fact has been pointed out by eminent conservative writers that many devout critics have been prone to make admissions and accept theories without seeing the logical conclusions to which these admissions and theories necessarily lead. In other words, the fact is cited that many who are long on scholarship are short on logic, a by no means uncommon fact. But, be this as it may, let us ask, Is this critical method, which is best described by the phrase "destructive criticism," so innocent as some of our younger writers would have us to believe? Are those who see danger in these theories silly alarmists or old fogies who get frightened at anything that is in any sense a departure from old traditional views or cherished beliefs, as some are fond of asserting? It should be borne in mind that the Scriptures are not simply an aggregation of ethical teachings, the value of which is independent of all outside considerations,

and unaffected by the question of authorship or date. The writings of the Old and New Testaments are not abstract teachings concerning spiritual things, but they present spiritual truths concretely in the history of men, families and nations. In this respect the Bible is unique. Truth is made to walk before us in incarnate form. In short, spiritual truth is closely linked to human history. The Bible is not a treatise on ethical philosophy, abstractly presented, but is largely a book of history. God's great plan moves majestically to its accomplishment through a patriarchal family and a chosen nation, culminating in the life and teachings of the perfect Man, who was a concrete manifestation of truth, and hence it is said, "His life was the light of men."

2. Following this biography of the person who was "God manifest in the flesh," we have the history of the establishment of his kingdom through his chosen apostles. It will at once be seen that it is impossible to divorce the ethical and religious teachings of the Bible from the history with which they are inseparably connected. In short, the historic verity of the facts recorded is a matter of supreme importance, and the historic accuracy of the facts depends largely upon the question of authorship and date.

It is true, as a general proposition, that the value of a book is determined by its subject-matter rather than by its authorship. What is in a book, rather than who wrote it, is ordinarily the important fact. This rule, however, will not hold good in the case of the Pentateuch. Here the question of authorship is a matter of vital importance, owing to the peculiar nature of its subject-matter, and to the fact that its trustworthiness as a historic document is thereby de-

termined. Even a hasty sketch of this document will not only show this to be true, but will also reveal its far-reaching relations, and its fundamental character as Biblical literature. I would therefore call attention to:

II. The contents of the Pentateuch and the importance of a right view concerning it.

1. The Pentateuch professes to give a record of the creation of the material world, of vegetable life and of all animal forms, culminating in the creation of man. It then takes up man's history and traces it from Eden onward, giving an account of the introduction of sin into the world, of the development of wickedness and the consequent destruction of the ungodly world. Then follows the account of Babel and the dispersion of mankind over the earth. Running through it all, it traces a righteous line from Adam through Noah to Abraham, the father of a nation which was selected by God as the receptacle of divine revelation, and which, in the outworking of the divine purpose, embraced the lineage through which the Messiah came. Beginning with Abraham, the development of the chosen nation is traced—the bondage, the deliverance, the giving of the laws that formed the national constitution, the amplification of the law, thus furnishing an elaborate civil and religious code, the disciplinary period of forty years in the wilderness under the special providence of God, and the leadership of Moses through it all, ending just before the nation passed over Jordan to take possession of its promised inheritance, for which their whole previous history had been a preparation. It is evident that the Pentateuch, if it is what it purports to be, stands in vital relation not only to

early secular history, but to archeological and ethnological science as well. Nay, more, it is the foundation of all subsequent divine communications, including the revelation we have in Jesus Christ, and hence it is the basis of Christian faith. It will be seen, therefore, that it is hardly possible to exaggerate its importance.

2. Is the Pentateuch a reliable historic document, or is it a conglomerate mixture of fable, legend, allegory and some truly historic matter, the latter, however, being so skillfully interwoven with the fiction that it can not with any certainty be disentangled so that we may really know what we can safely accept? In the decision of this question, that of authorship must necessarily play an important part. It will also be evident that the question of inspiration is involved in the decision reached. Inspiration will mean one thing to him who accepts the Mosaic authorship, and an entirely different thing to him who accepts the rival hypothesis known as the analytical theory. This will become evident in the course of this discussion, if it is not sufficiently clear upon the mere statement of the proposition.

3. Furthermore, be it observed that the view taken as to the authorship of the Pentateuch determines not only the character of the writings in the mind of the student, but, to a large degree, the view of the whole question of revelation is thus fixed. The Bible is one sort of book to those who accept the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and a very different kind of book to those who accept the rival hypothesis. I do not go too far when I say the difference is so great as to make out of the Bible two different books. To the former it is a revelation of God to man in part direct, in part through men inspired of

God to speak his message, and in part through angels; obscure in the beginning, but rising to higher and higher levels as man is capacitated to receive growing measures of truth. To the latter it is a record of the unfolding of the divine nature that is resident in man by virtue of his creation, giving expression to his ever-growing religious conceptions and marking his struggles as he rises through the resident divine factor into fuller light and knowledge. To the latter as to the former, it is a growing revelation, but the revelation in the former view is the result of an immediate inspiration, given for a specific purpose, and superhuman in its character; to the latter it is the result of a resident inspiration that belongs to all men, potentially, if not actually, but more fully developed or more actively alive in some than in others. It will be seen that the latter view reduces the Bible to the plane of the world's books, the only difference, if any, being the higher type of spiritual conceptions which some of the Bible writers have shown by virtue of the superior strength of the resident divine force due to their peculiar history, circumstances and environments. Nay, more, we may go further and say we ought to look for a higher degree of inspiration in the writings of the best and most spiritual men to-day, since much progress has been made in two millenniums in expressing religious conceptions, strengthened as this resident divinity must have been under the stimulating effects and fostering care of Christianity. It must be apparent, therefore, that the character of any discussion of the literature of the Bible will be determined by the position taken on this question.

4. It is furthermore true that he who would write anything of value concerning the sacred Scriptures

must have settled convictions on a matter so fundamentally important as this. I am therefore under the necessity of taking a definite stand on this question, which I am very willing to do, since I think I have good reasons for the faith which is within me, which I trust I shall be able to make apparent in the course of this discussion. I unhesitatingly accept the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch without the slightest misgiving as to the result upon myself or upon those who may possibly be influenced by what I have to say on the subject, and I will add that the more I read on the subject, pro and con, the more firmly my faith becomes fixed. To announce in advance one's position on a subject about to be studied may not be considered in harmony with the true scientific method. In fact, I have listened, day after day, to men laying before their students both sides of a case, all the time failing to disclose, if not carefully concealing, their own convictions, but I do not consider this method in a controversy such as this either necessary or right. I believe the arguments on both sides should be presented fairly, but at the same time I believe a writer or teacher ought to have decided convictions and not hesitate to let those convictions be known. A colorless writer is never of much assistance to the cause of truth.

I desire next to briefly consider as a preliminary study:

III. The life and work of Moses.

If this does not have a direct bearing on the question under consideration, it at least has a very important indirect relation to the subject in hand.

That Moses was one of the most important of Bible

characters is conceded by all who regard the Bible with any degree of reverence or respect. As the mediator of the covenant with Israel, he is typical of our Lord, who was the mediator of the new covenant. He was the lawgiver of the old dispensation, as Christ was the lawgiver of the new. He wrought miracles in the establishment of the divinity of his mission, as Christ wrought miracles in the establishment of his claims. He led Israel out of the bondage of Egypt, as Christ leads the world out of the bondage of sin. Israel was baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, as the believer is baptized into Christ in the waters of Christian baptism. He led the Israelites for forty years in the desert, bringing them to the borders of the promised land, as Christ leads the spiritual Israel through life's pilgrimage to the Canaan of everlasting rest.

His genealogical line stands as follows: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Cohath, Amram, Moses. His mother's name was Jochebed, and he had a brother, Aaron, and a sister, Miriam. God gave Aaron to be his mouthpiece when he sent him on a mission to Pharaoh to ask him to emancipate the Israelites, which grew out of the fact that Moses was not a fluent speaker.

Miriam came prominently into view at the time of the deliverance, when she responded to the song of victory on the shore of the Red Sea. She, like Moses, had the poetic gift, as is directly affirmed in the Scriptures. She and Aaron, while directly associated with Moses as the deliverer of Israel, yet on one occasion spoke against Moses on account of his marriage with a Cushite woman, for which act of —shall I say disloyalty?—Miriam was severely pun-

ished. This is an illustration of the weaknesses incident to a great and noble nature.

Moses' life readily divides itself into three parts:

1. For forty years he was essentially an Egyptian, having been reared in the king's court by the king's daughter. The circumstances leading to this are too familiar to need repetition here. As we would naturally expect, and as we are expressly told, he was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. His educational advantages must have been the best the age afforded; we may reasonably conclude that whatever of historic documents and records may have been extant, not only in Egypt, but outside as well, were accessible to him, since Egypt was in touch with surrounding nations. The education of Moses was by no means as meager as we might be led to conclude by considering the remoteness of the period in which he lived. Egypt had even at that time made considerable educational progress. Reading and writing in hieroglyphic form were taught, and in addition to the Egyptian language it is probable that a Semite dialect closely akin to Hebrew was studied. Professor Robertson, in his work entitled "Early Religion of Israel," speaks of the discovery at Tel-el-Amarna, in Egypt, of clay tablets in the Babylonian language dating back of the exodus, which he argues proves that the art of writing was not only then known, but widely diffused, presupposing no small degree of culture. The early date of the cuneiform inscriptions also establishes the fact of the great antiquity of the art of writing. It is no longer a matter of doubt that the age of literature long antedates the time of Moses. The curricula of the schools of Egypt were by no means meager. Written language was not the only thing taught. Arithmetic

was also studied, and it is said the Egyptians were good arithmeticians. They also had a knowledge of music, and Philo says Moses was taught music. His knowledge of poetry may have been obtained from the study of Egyptian poetry. Egypt at that time had two seats of learning, Heliopolis and Hermopolis. In these schools or universities, geometry, literature, astronomy, law, medicine, chemistry and composition, especially epistolary correspondence, were taught. Moses' early education was doubtless directed by tutors at the king's court, but it is highly probable that he would be sent to the universities for his later education, else how could he be taught in all the wisdom of the Egyptians? Tradition declares that Moses chose a soldier's calling, which does not seem improbable, since a man of his peculiar characteristics could scarcely consent to become an idler at the king's court, leading an aimless life; besides, ample opportunity was offered for military life. Josephus says Moses commanded the Egyptian army in a great war waged against Ethiopia, and was eminently successful in his campaign. In the speech of Stephen recorded in the New Testament, Moses, during his Egyptian life, is declared to have been "mighty in word and in deed," which most naturally suggests his military exploits. Can we fail to see in all this the providence of God in preparing him to be the leader of the hosts of Israel, as he afterwards became? By education and training he was prepared for the threefold task he was destined to perform as historian, lawgiver and military leader.

2. But we must hasten to consider Moses as an Arabian. At the age of forty, being compelled to flee from Egypt on account of having slain an Egyptian in defense of his own countryman, he took refuge in the

land of Midian. He was received into the family of Jethro (Reuel) and married his daughter Zipporah. For forty years he was a servant, acting in the capacity of a shepherd. We must not look upon him as a slave, but rather as a refugee who had been kindly received, perhaps, out of gratitude by the benevolent priest who afterward became his father-in-law. Moses, hitherto having led a very stirring life, now adopted a pastoral life well suited as another step in his preparations for his future work. Pastoral life is a wonderfully peaceful life, eminently favorable to reflection and meditation, and hence to the development of wisdom of which he would stand in pressing need when the great burdens he was destined to bear should be laid upon his shoulders. He needed a long period of solitude that he might mature or ripen, so to speak, preparatory to the taking up of his great task. Many of God's great heroes have profited by periods of solitude. Elijah spent much of his life in the quiet resorts of Gilead; John the Baptist was a desert man. Our Saviour grew up and matured in the quiet of Nazareth. Paul spent three years in Arabia just after his conversion. Luther was confined to a monk's cell for a considerable time. In short, periods of devout isolation seem to possess peculiar value in the development of a great personality. Then, too, Moses needed to be brought into a nearer and closer fellowship with God, and there is no condition so favorable for this as solitude. It is not always easy to hear the voice of God in the busy, seething throng. In the babel of the world's voices the voice of God is often lost. God said to Ezekiel: "Go forth into the plain and I will there talk with thee." In the solitudes of Arabia, while Moses kept his flocks, he

enjoyed the most favorable conditions possible for coming into close fellowship with God, which was the preparation above all others that he needed most. To stand undaunted in the presence of Pharaoh it was necessary to stand in God's strength, conscious of his presence and sure of his help.

3. Moses now became an Israelite indeed. At the end of forty years spent in the wilderness, he was miraculously arrested by the voice of God and sent, in company with his brother Aaron, to Egypt, to lead his people out of bondage. He performed many wonders, finally succeeding in delivering his people. He gave them God's law from Sinai and transformed them, during a period of forty years spent in the wilderness march, from Egyptian serfs into a mighty nation. He was a man of wonderful gifts and acquirements, being a prophet, an historian, a lawgiver, a poet, a general, a statesman and a patriot. Patriotism has ever been characteristic of great souls. In all these directions he was mighty, easily ranking among the greatest historic characters of the race.

It is interesting to inquire:

IV. Was Moses' work entirely new, or did he inherit something from others as a foundation on which to build?

1. It is certainly evident that he made a distinct advance upon the political, social and religious ideas that prevailed among his people prior to his arrival upon the scene. That is, another decided step was taken in the direction of a fuller revelation, but without question he had a foundation to build upon of no uncertain or unimportant character. From the

beginning of creation down to Moses' time a righteous line had been preserved to whom divine communications had been vouchsafed from time to time. The light, to be sure, was dim, fitly compared to starlight, but the people had some idea of God and of duty to him. They had sufficient light to clearly separate them from the Egyptians, whose religious ideas were crude, gross and sensual. However, the roots of idolatry had not yet been eradicated, nor was this fully accomplished until a thousand years had rolled by. The name Jehovah had been given to them as the name of the God of Israel. Even the more reasonable of the destructive critics admit that the more advanced portion of the people had reached a stage of henotheism, which is a long step from polytheism. However, the view that the masses of Israel were at this time henotheistic has slight support in the Scriptures. It is by no means a necessary inference. In point of fact it is a position necessitated by the exigencies of the theory of evolution, and it has been promulgated rather in the interest of the theory than as a fact deduced from the history given us. That Israel fully grasped, at this period, the doctrine of monotheism is not probable, but they were gradually moving into larger conceptions of Jehovah and his omnipotence.

2. The Egyptians had many ideas of government, law and medicine, and they had made great progress in military matters, with all of which Moses must have become acquainted, to some extent at least, and which must have been very helpful to him.

3. Then, too, Moses' residence in Midian must have been very valuable to him, not only in giving him time for mature reflection and communion with

God, but in affording him a knowledge of pastoral life, which was to be in a large measure the life of his people. No doubt his Midian experience was very useful to him during the forty years that he led his people in their journeyings through the desert.

4. As to how much in the way of written historic matter may have come into the possession of Moses we are unable to determine, but certainly there was more or less of written history extant in the form of detached records and annals. If, as the critics claim, there is evidence in the Pentateuch of previous documents that entered into its composition, such a fact does not necessarily conflict with the Mosaic authorship of the document.

5. It is claimed that a part of the precepts of the Decalogue were in existence before Moses' time. If this could be shown, does it make against the statement that Moses received the Decalogue, written by the finger of God on tables of stone? I trow not. I believe it to be a tenable position that God's primary revelations are found in the constitutional wants of the soul which it is the purpose of the secondary or word revelation to meet and satisfy. Where do we find the first revelation of an external world? In the sights and sounds and other sensuous evidences that come to us? I think, rather, in the ear and eye and organs of touch, taste and smell which are mute witnesses of the external world before its sensuous evidences are recognized. Where is the first revelation of God? In the external world and written word? Nay, rather in the soul so constituted as to receive and enjoy God and reach its fullest development only as God is apprehended

in his true relations to the soul. If this be true, does it not follow that the external written law comes to meet the internal want, consciously or unconsciously present in the soul, and to which, therefore, the soul responds and gives its sanctions? Then, as the religious nature reaches out after God and gives expression to some ideas of him and of his worship, that are just and true even where the verbal revelation has not gone, why may not the native craving for divine law, struggling after satisfaction, have given expression to some of the very precepts of the Decalogue? This suggestion, for I will not dignify it by the name "argument," may have but little weight; still, if it can be shown that some of the precepts of the Decalogue existed before Moses' time, such a fact would not discredit the Mosaic legislation or minimize its importance.

6. But that Moses made a distinct advance in the Decalogue upon any previous code is not denied, so far as I know. For instance, the law against covetousness is a long step in advance. It carries sin from the external act to the internal desire. It recognizes not simply the overt act, but the inward purpose. It has been truly said that the moral standards laid down by Moses were never surpassed till the Sermon on the Mount was preached. This is certainly a very awkward fact for the theory of the destructive critics to contend with, and how it can be reconciled with the theory of evolution is not apparent. Moses' perception of ethical truth was keen and marvelously clear. He laid the foundation of one of the most wonderful religions the world has seen, second only to the religion of Christ for which

it prepared the way. His conceptions of religious truth were comprehensive, just and exceedingly high. While his people were in a measure tinctured with idolatry—and let it be conceded that some of them had not advanced beyond henotheism—yet Moses was clearly a monotheist. He had the true spiritual conception of the one true and living God.

7. In conclusion, I will mention two additional items that deserve at least a passing notice:

(1) Moses' power of organization must have been of a very high order. To successfully organize such an undisciplined host, a people just released from a long period of bondage, mere children in knowledge and development, is a feat that stands unparalleled in the history of the world. One of R. G. Ingersoll's arguments against the Bible is based on this alleged fact, which he claimed was impossible; in fact, nothing short of a stupendous miracle which he rejected. In truth, does it not call for the supplementing of the human by the divine which is in perfect keeping with Moses' claim? It has been charged that Moses got his suggestion of organization from Jethro, his father-in-law, but if this be true, he did not get his ability to successfully put the idea into practice. True, Jethro did suggest a certain kind of organization for the accomplishment of a particular work, but the general idea of organization did not come from Jethro. Moses was a successful organizer long before he received Jethro's suggestion, or he could never have successfully led his people out of Egypt, and his subsequent success depended on forms of organization that Jethro's suggestion did not touch.

(2) His principles of government were so true, so abiding, so comprehensive that they have come to underlie all beneficent forms of government, and particularly republics. Moses was democratic in his feelings and sympathies. He was pre-eminently a man of the people, as all really great men have ever been. In this he resembles his great antitype, Jesus of Nazareth, who was the greatest commoner the world has seen.

CHAPTER VII.

The Authorship of the Pentateuch—Two Rival Theories Considered.

THE ANALYTICAL THEORY.

The question as to the authorship of the Pentateuch raises an issue over which a fierce battle is being waged, and, as was said in the previous lecture, the most tremendous and far-reaching consequences are involved. Let no one for a moment imagine that it is a matter of indifference as to which way the battle goes. To my mind, on the settlement of this question hangs the question as to whether we have **The Bible** or a bible; **A Book of Authority** in morals and religion, or a book recording the efforts of uninspired men to express their conceptions of God and spiritual truth.

As already stated, there are two rival theories that lead to widely different conclusions as to the nature of this document, and consequently to widely divergent views as to the trustworthiness of its professedly historic narratives. This fact lends to this discussion a peculiar interest because of the tremendous consequences involved.

I. Let us place the two theories side by side that we may see clearly wherein they differ.

Here, however, I am confronted with a very great difficulty. To state the theory of the destructive

critics concisely and briefly, is a manifest impossibility, since it has taken on numerous forms, each differing from the others in certain particulars. The best that can be done is to reduce the theory to its lowest terms, which has been done by J. W. McGarvey in his work entitled "The Authorship of Deuteronomy," and whom I shall follow in my statement. This will at least reveal its broad general principles.

1. The oldest, and what has been denominated the "traditional view," maintains that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and that the laws recorded there came from God through him to the children of Israel. Those who hold this view do not deny that in preparing the historic matter, covering the period from Adam down to his own day, he may have made use of material gathered from reliable tradition, and from documents that may have been in existence before his time, being guarded from mistakes by inspiration and using his material in a way that would not deny to him the real authorship of the production; in short, as any first-class writer of history uses the matter at his command. This view was entertained by the Israelitish nation from the beginning onward, if we may trust the statements found throughout the Old Testament Scriptures as well as those of the Jewish historians. This same view was generally entertained in the time of Christ and his apostles, as is abundantly shown by the New Testament writers. It also generally obtained for the first ten centuries of the Christian era or more, and it has been held by the great majority of Christians even down to the present time.

2. The second theory, called the analytical or divisive hypothesis, has taken on different forms at

different times, occasioned by efforts to relieve the particular forms of the theory most in favor at a given time from obvious inconsistencies and embarrassing facts standing in its way.* It will be impossible to discuss the various hypotheses that arose each upon the ruins of the one that preceded it, nor is it necessary. Those who wish to go into the subject in detail may read with profit the presentation of the conservative side by Prof. W. H. Green, in his work entitled "The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch," or Bissell's work on "The Origin and Structure of the Pentateuch." The presentation from the opposite side can be found in the writings of any who accept the divisive hypothesis. Wellhausen's article on the Pentateuch in the Encyclopedia Britannica is perhaps as satisfactory as any for a comparatively brief statement. Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" is much more extensive, but too technical for the ordinary reader. It is a noteworthy fact that none of the analytical theories are accepted by all of the divisive school without more or less modification. In fact, no two will agree on every point. The theory in its simplest form, and that has met with considerable sanction, may be briefly summarized as follows:

(1) It is claimed by the most extreme party that Moses was the author of no part of the Pentateuch, except the Decalogue in a very much abridged form, or, rather, the most extreme party of all contend that Moses is not even a historical character, much less a writer of any part of the Decalogue. Some not quite so radical are willing to give him what is called the

*Professor Green in "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch."

book of the covenant (Ex. 20: 23). The Mosaic writings are thus reduced to an exceedingly small compass at most.

(2) As the starting-point of the Pentateuch as we now have it, two writings are assumed to have been produced about the eighth or ninth century B. C., which are designated as the Elohistic and Jevohistic documents, because it was supposed that Elohim was used exclusively to designate the Deity in one of these documents and Jehovah in the other, as was stated in a previous chapter. These documents, it is claimed, entered into the composition of the Pentateuch, which, however, did not appear in its present form until three, four or five centuries later. It will be borne in mind that there is no historic reference to these documents, the evidence for them being found, as is claimed, in the structure of the Pentateuch, some portions of which have been assigned to one of these documents and some to the other, the ground of division being the use of the names for the Deity referred to above. That is, the passages in which the name "Elohim" is used are assigned to one document, and the passages in which "Jehovah" is used are assigned to the other. By separating out the passages belonging to their respective documents, and piecing them together, it is supposed that the original documents have, in part at least, been reproduced. The writers of these two documents, according to the hypothesis, repeated some things in common with slight variations, but each writing also contained some matter peculiar to itself, and the reconstructed documents are supposed to substantiate the hypothesis. But the analysis is by no means as simple as one might be led to

conclude from this statement. More documents are needed in order to account for the Pentateuch in its present form, which the theory very obligingly provides.

(3) A third hypothetical document is next introduced, and assigned to a period somewhat later than the former two documents. This writing is supposed to have been produced by patching together sections taken alternately from Elohistic and Jehovistic documents, the copyist, of course, selecting the matter in each document that suited his purpose, and here and there making some additions of his own. However, this document, according to the hypothesis, is largely a piece of patchwork, there being but little attempt on the part of the compiler at originality. When the third document appeared, the first two documents are then supposed to have been lost, leaving the literary curiosity just described as the only writing extant. The necessity for these hypothetical documents will presently appear.

(4) Next follows the composition of a part of Deuteronomy, which, according to the divisive theory, was the first book of the Pentateuch written, although in much shorter form than it afterward assumed in the hands of some unknown editor. The original book, it is supposed, contained only the legislative portion, in volume about one-third of the book as we now have it. This book, according to the hypothesis, was written by some unknown author in the early part of the seventh century B. C., and hidden away in the temple where it was found by Hilkiah, the priest, in 621 B. C., and brought to King Josiah, who was marvelously affected by it, being led thereby to institute radical reforms. The

authorship was ascribed to Moses, although it appeared seven hundred years after his time, the object being to lend to the book the authority of the great lawgiver, who was held in profound respect and veneration, although, according to the theory, he never wrote a single law except, perhaps, a short form of the Decalogue, and possibly one other brief document occupying the space of three or four chapters in Exodus. Notwithstanding this, it seems he had great prestige as lawgiver among the Israelites, since king, priest and people accepted the book without protest or any sign of reluctance, although it overthrew long-established customs, revolutionized the worship and laid unaccustomed burdens on the people.

The whole scheme of writing and hiding the book in the temple where it must needs be found, is regarded as a device of the metropolitan priests for centralizing the worship in Jerusalem, which, it is claimed, had hitherto been scattered. In proof of this, the passage in 1 Kings 14:23 is cited, where it is said: "They also" (Judah) "built them high places, and pillars, and Asherim, on every high hill, and under every green tree." From this and other passages, it is inferred that there was no law restricting the worship to one place, and consequently that the legislation commonly regarded as Mosaic was not then in existence. It will be seen that up to this time, according to the analytical theory, but slight progress had been made toward the production of the Pentateuch in its present form. The third document that was mentioned, that displaced the two earlier documents, contained, it is supposed, a part of the matter now found in the Pentateuch, notably in

Genesis, and the book found in the temple contained about one-third of the matter now found in Deuteronomy, but no start had been made on the three books, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers.

(5) Sometime during the next few years, probably before the Babylonian captivity, the theory assumes that another step was taken consisting of the writing of a body of laws by some unknown author, presumably some priest, which is called the priestly law, or law of holiness. These laws are embodied in the Book of Leviticus, chapters 17 to 21. We now have the nucleus of a third book.

(6) We next come to a very large step in the development. It is claimed that another book was written, about the close of the captivity, much larger than any preceding. The historical portions of the composite document that preceded the book found by Hilkiah are used, much new matter being introduced, giving us the Book of Genesis substantially as we now have it. He also composed what we may call a rough draft of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, embodying, of course, in Leviticus, the body of laws just referred to as the law of holiness. Nearly all of the matter found in the Pentateuch is now accounted for, but it is separated into four documents. Of course it would not do to combine these documents without change, since possibly more or less of repetition and contradiction would be involved and there would certainly be an utter lack of unity.

(7) The final step is then taken. Some unknown editor is supposed to have taken the four documents referred to, and out of them to have evolved the Pentateuch as we have it, adding original portions as the necessities of the case demanded. It is

claimed that this final work is of such a nature that the scraps from the documents entering into it can be separated out and pieced together, so that the original documents, it is supposed, have thus been substantially reproduced. The process of analysis is so exact and refined that not only paragraphs, but sentences, and even parts of sentences, can be identified and placed in their original setting.

I here call attention to the letters by which the various writers and documents are designated in critical discussions: E is used to designate the Elohistic writer, J the Jehovistic, R the editor who framed the document known as J E from the writings of J and E. D designates the Deuteronomic document found by Hilkiah in the temple, H the law of holiness incorporated in Leviticus (chaps. 17-22), P the priestly writer who wrote the document embracing part of Genesis and the main body of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. Then comes another editor or redactor, who completed the Pentateuch. Thus, instead of one author—Moses—we have at least five authors and two redactors who contributed to the production of the Pentateuch. As before stated, this is the simplest form of the theory; in fact, far too simple to meet all the requirements of the case. Other authors and redactors must needs be introduced to bolster up the theory and save it from breaking down. Hence, as Professor Green remarks: "The critics further distinguish J-1 and J-2, E-1 and E-2, P-1, P-2 and P-3, D-1 and D-2, which represent different strata in the documents. Different redactors are embraced under the general symbol R; viz.: Rj, who combined J and E; Rd, who added D to J E, and Rh, who com-

pleted the Hexateuch by combining P with J E D." This is the method that professedly Christian critics ask us to believe that God adopted in giving a revelation to man. For unbelievers in a divine revelation to accept this theory seems to me to be entirely consistent, but I fail to see how believers can accept it except at the sacrifice of faith in the Bible as a revelation of God.

Between these two hypotheses, therefore, I have no difficulty in deciding in favor of the Mosaic authorship. The principal direct arguments supporting this position will be given in a subsequent chapter. The reason I here assign is a negative one. I accept the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch because I am compelled to reject the divisive hypothesis which is the only alternative presented.

I here submit:

II. A few reasons that seem to be decisive against the analytical theory.

1. The Pentateuch is a continuous work, apparently the product of a single writer, logically connected, and proceeding in an orderly way from first to last. There is a definite plan and a clearly defined purpose, toward which the movement is continuous from the first chapters of Genesis to the last chapter of Deuteronomy. This does not mean that there may not be an insertion occasionally, by some editor or copyist, of an explanatory clause or passage, or even an account of some important event, such, for instance, as the obituary notice of Moses, but these slight additions are but few at most, and do not in any way interfere with the integrity or unity of the writing.

Another thing worthy of note is the fact that there are no sudden breaks showing violent transitions, as would seem to be necessarily involved by the analytical theory. That such a writing could have been produced in the manner suggested, involves, as I believe, a literary impossibility. How a writing, made up of scraps or clippings from documents independently produced, and so little changed that they can be separated out and assigned to their original writings, could show the qualities above described, surpasses my comprehension. If the Pentateuch were a heterogeneous mass of disconnected anecdotes and stories, the divisive theory would have a very strong argument in its support in the nature of the book itself, but, being such a book as it is, the theory is utterly discredited unless the claim of unity above put forth is not well founded, and this I do not think can be successfully opposed.

2. Doubt is thrown upon the analytical theory by the fact that the method employed can be applied to other writings, the authorship of which no one would dream of calling in question, with similar results, as has been demonstrated again and again. Prof. W. H. Green, in an amusing way, applies the method to the analysis of the two stories, "The Prodigal Son" and the "Good Samaritan," showing them to be of composite character. Prof. C. M. Mead (E. D. McRealsham) shows the absurdity of the method, in his work entitled "Romans Dissected." The late Prof. H. Turner, once well known in Kentucky, wrote an article, which never found its way into print, but which I have in my possession, on "Julius Cæsar a Myth," using the canons employed by the analytical school with telling effect. Professor Green also calls

attention to the havoc wrought in the writings of Homer and in Cicero's orations by the methods of the destructive critics. In short, it is quite evident that almost any writing, whether historic or didactic, can be shown to be composite in character—that is, made up of diverse parts patched together—by the application of the canons employed in the analysis of the Pentateuch.

3. The analytical theory loses much of its force owing to the fact that the proofs upon which the main reliance is put do not lend the support claimed for them. In other words, the fundamental principle of the analysis can not be rigidly enforced.

It is true, as the advocates of the analytical theory claim, that the names "Elohim" and "Jehovah" appear respectively in alternate sections in the early part of Genesis with considerable regularity. This somewhat singular fact is accounted for by assuming that the writer had before him two documents in one of which the name "Elohim" was used to designate God, and in the other the name "Jehovah" was used, and that the story as we now have it was made up by mechanically piecing together sections taken alternately from the two documents. This theory was first applied to Genesis, but afterward applied to the whole Pentateuch. It was held, in the second place, that these alternate sections, when separated out and pieced together, formed two separate and independent narratives. It was furthermore maintained that in some cases the same event is twice narrated in Genesis with slight modification, thus pointing to two independent histories, embracing in part the same stories which were brought together by the mechanical process of construction above described. Finally, it is claimed

that the two independent documents, when reconstructed, show such differences of literary style and such diversities of ideas as to make it clear that the original documents have been reproduced. As Professor Green clearly shows, the reasons for rejecting this apparently plausible theory are good and sufficient: First, the names "Elohim" and "Jehovah" are not two names of God that are exact synonyms and can therefore be used interchangeably, but are used to express two distinct conceptions. Elohim is the general name used to express the God idea, whether applied to the one true and living God or to false gods. When applied to the true God it is used to express his relations to all nations of the world at large; that is, God as creator and as exercising his general providence. The term "Jehovah" expresses God's special relations to individuals, and to Israel as his chosen nation. This distinction in the use of the names affords an explanation of the passage in Ex. 6:3, which reads as follows: "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob, . . . but by my name Jehovah I was not known to them." The advocates of the divisive hypothesis claim that according to this passage the name "Jehovah" was not known to the patriarchs, but was here announced to Moses for the first time, and that the prior use of this name was made by a writer who believed it had a much earlier origin. This objection, however, is shown to be groundless when the real meaning of the passage, as interpreted in the light of parallel passages, is shown to be, not that the patriarchs had never heard the name "Jehovah," but that they had not known him as manifesting those special attributes and showing those providential dealings that the name

implied, and which were now to be shown forth in a peculiar way in his dealings with Israel.* A further objection to the analysis founded on the use of the two names for the Deity, is found in the fact that it is impossible to adjust the two hypothetical documents in harmony with this principle of division. Let it be borne in mind that the two writers designated as E and J must each, by hypothesis, confine himself to his own characteristic designation for God. This use of the two names for the Deity is the fundamental principle of the analysis. If this criterion fails, the analytical theory is placed under grave suspicion, to say the least. In fact, it is hard to see how it can be saved from a total breakdown.

Now, we would suppose that a theory that has been put forth with as much assurance as this has been, would show itself to be invulnerable at this vital point, but such is not the case. It has been found impossible to reconstruct the hypothetical documents in perfect agreement with the fundamental principle of the analysis. While a general conformity may be made to appear by a very careful division, but sometimes in a way that does violence to the sense of a passage by breaking asunder that which seems to be necessarily continuous, yet numerous exceptions occur baffling the utmost care and ingenuity to avoid them. Elohim is found in passages assigned to J, and Jehovah appears in E passages, and in P passages where Elohim should appear. This is exceedingly bad for the theory. It shows that the basal principle of the analysis for which so much is claimed is unreliable.*

As regards the claim that the reconstructed docu-

* Prof. Green: "Higher Criticism of Pentateuch."

ments are of such a nature as to indicate that the original documents have been measurably reproduced, and that the style of the two is very different, it is a sufficient answer to say that the same results are produced by analyzing confessedly singular documents, and when doubt and uncertainty is cast upon the criterion or principle of division the results claimed for its application can have but little weight. The argument based on the differences in the style of the two reconstructed documents is, at best, vague and uncertain.

4. The next reason for rejecting the analytical theory grows out of the fact that it is highly improbable that Deuteronomy could have come into existence and into force in the manner suggested. If the theory is correct, it is the most successful pious fraud ever practiced upon an innocent and unsuspecting people. A similar instance can not be found in all the annals of history, and it is perfectly safe to say that such a case can never occur again. The very suggestion is almost an insult to common sense, and it utterly disregards human nature as it has ever shown itself to be in its leading characteristics. That a people should accept a book they had never heard of before as the writing of a man who had been dead seven hundred years, and a book, too, that demanded extraordinary sacrifice, and completely revolutionized long-standing religious customs, which is the hardest thing in the world to accomplish, is certainly a most unique and extraordinary fact. We must suppose that neither these people nor their ancestors for the twenty generations of their national history had ever heard of this law requiring a central sanctuary, and yet they accepted the newly discov-

ered code centralizing the worship without protest or question as the law of Moses, believing that it had been in existence since his day, hidden somewhere so securely that it had never been heard of, but had just now been discovered in the temple. *Mirabile dictu.*

We can now see a reason for the preceding hypothetical documents. This newly discovered epoch-making book made certain allusions which demanded pre-existing documents; in fact, just such a background as is furnished for Deuteronomy in the previous books of the Pentateuch. Having therefore thrown away the previous books of the Pentateuch, or rather having assumed that they were not yet written, documents must needs be forthcoming to take their place, which would explain the references in Deuteronomy.

Is not the temptation very strong to regard the hypothetical documents as an invention to meet the demands of the partition theory, rather than to regard them as veritable historic documents proven to have had an existence by the application of reliable canons of criticism to the Pentateuch as we now have it? Can the average man be blamed for being slow to accept critical criteria as reliable which lead to such astonishing results?

5. The acceptance of the analytical hypothesis necessarily weakens faith in the professedly historic character of the Pentateuch. Instead of being a book of history, it becomes a book of legend and fable. Instead of being a reliable record of historic facts, made by one who was an eye-witness of a great part of the history he records, and, in fact, was one of the main actors in the history, it is a piece of patchwork

made up of documents written from six hundred to one thousand years after the events occurred, the first documents being written by two unknown authors, who gathered up the stories floating among the people of the northern and southern kingdoms, and out of these constructed the Elohistic and Jehovistic documents. Is it possible to have any confidence whatsoever in a history produced in this way? In fact, the theory in question utterly destroys the Pentateuch as a reliable book of history. It places it on a lower plane than the grotesque historical books of the heathen religions, because it removes its authors much further from the events which they profess to record. Who can believe in the historic verity of the facts recorded if this theory be true? Suppose we had no records or historic documents contemporary with William the Conqueror or with Christopher Columbus, who lived but half as long ago, what would history written now, bearing on the events of these periods, be worth? That is exactly what the critical method that some would have us believe is so innocent does for the historic facts recorded in the Pentateuch. In short, we can not be sure that the Pentateuch records a single really historical incident. Can such views be regarded as harmless? Are they calculated to strengthen faith? Is the preacher, who in the quiet of his study saturates himself with such literature and enters into sympathy with it, better prepared for aggressive work in the kingdom of God, or for strengthening his brethren in the faith?

But this is not the worst. The critics, as we have seen, tell us that the law of Moses was not given by Moses, barring possibly a few brief sentences of the Decalogue, and the more radical deny to him even

that much; that it is all an invention of later ages, a sort of cumulative code that began to be formulated probably as much as eight hundred years after Moses' time. It should be noted that the latest form of the theory makes the legislation of Deuteronomy the earliest part of the Pentateuch. What follows from all this? First, that the history reciting God's punishment of the Israelites for disobeying the law is necessarily fictitious, since there was no divine law for them to disobey; second, discredit is thrown on all of the remaining books of the Old Testament, since they refer to the law as of Mosaic origin, and recite Israel's disobedience to the law, attributing the national misfortune to this cause; third, we must believe that the author of Deuteronomy, in putting speeches into the mouth of Moses that he never uttered and attributing laws to him that he never promulgated, did that which can be justified on moral ground and which is in harmony with true ethical principles. Who can believe it? Fourth, the New Testament writers are also impeached, since they evidently shared the views of the Old Testament historians and prophets, and even the wisdom and knowledge of our Lord himself are called in question, since he evidently believed there was such a lawgiver as Moses. Call me a fogy, if you will, and exclude me from the charmed circle of the scholars about whom so many complimentary things are said, but do not ask me to adopt a method of Biblical study which leads to such results and expect me to maintain my faith in Christianity and the inspiration of the Bible. I, therefore, am free to say that I contemplate with alarm the inevitable tendencies and results of this critical method. I can not regard it

as innocent and harmless. My fears, however, are greatly quieted by the fact that I do not believe that these theories will be accepted by the sober common sense of the religious world. This so-called "Method of Study" should share the fate of the rationalistic and infidel attacks upon the Bible, with which it may very properly be classed.

6. To accept the analytical theory is virtually to give up faith in a divine revelation, other than that which gives expression to the supposed resident divinity in man; for who can bring himself to believe that God has resorted to the method of the hypothesis in giving a revelation? To deny that the Pentateuch is a divine revelation, logically leads to the denial of a divine revelation altogether. The subsequent books of the Bible, almost without exception, refer to the Pentateuch and treat it as an inspired book, which really means that the whole Bible stands or falls together. It is so inter-related, so woven together by references, types and prophecies, that to cut out the Pentateuch is to destroy the book. I am well aware that many who are disposed to accept the critical hypothesis would resent the charge of not believing that we have a revelation of God in the Bible. But one of two things is true: Either their idea of revelation is so radically different from all that has been commonly understood by that term, that it virtually amounts to a denial of special revelation, or they do not see the logical result to which the theory leads. The former class realize the revolutionary tendency of the hypothesis, and shrink from the terrible consequences involved, hoping, however, for a readjustment of faith in the Scriptures upon a new basis.

7. Doubt is cast upon the theory under discussion, because none of the documents, which it is claimed existed as proven by the critical analysis, have survived, nor is there a single outside reference to any of them in Hebrew literature or in the literature of the world. This is certainly a remarkable—and shall I not say a suspicious?—fact. After the documents of E and J were written, why did not some of the subsequent authors or editors refer to these documents? Why did not the author of J E refer to his sources of knowledge? Why did not R refer to the three documents that he edited, expounded and supplemented? Why did not the last redactor give at least some slight intimation of the four documents on which his editorial labors were expended? The silence of each author and redactor concerning all the writers that preceded him, and with whose works he was dealing, is simply amazing! Finally under this head, since the work of the last redactor, the present Pentateuch written at least five hundred years B. C., has been preserved to us, how does it happen that the four documents he had in hand have all been lost? Are not these circumstances sufficient in themselves to raise grave doubts, at least in the minds of the average reader?

8. Confidence in the divisive hypothesis is greatly shaken by the fact that the critics who favor it have been in much conflict among themselves, the theory that was in favor at one time having been displaced by a rival theory at a later time, and even the judgment as to priority of the hypothetical documents having been reversed. If the conclusions in the past have been so uncertain that they have had to be abandoned one after another, what assurance have

we that the theory that now meets with most favor will not have to be given up? In fact, the history of the whole case warrants such an expectation.

9. Another reason for rejecting the analytical hypothesis is found in the fact that there are certain gaps or omissions, which the advocates of the theory claim would have been filled in if a single author had produced the document. In other words, one of the arguments urged in favor of the theory turns out to be against it when carefully examined.

As instances in point, the failure to record at greater length the private life of Moses, the history of the sojourn in Egypt, and the details of the forty years' wandering in the wilderness are cited. But this simply shows with what singleness of aim the writer pursued his purpose, turning neither to right nor left to record interesting matter that did not bear directly on his subject. Let us suppose that the first documents were produced six or seven hundred years after Moses' time and made up of stories floating among the people, folk-lore as we might say. Is it to be supposed that none of these oral traditions bore upon the life of the Israelites in Egypt, or upon the incidents of the forty years' wandering in the wilderness, or upon the private life of Moses? If they did so, would the writers of the earliest documents have omitted all such matter, which in the very nature of the case would have had most interest for the people for whom they wrote? The gaps therefore that are urged as making against the Mosaic authorship turn out as making in a most positive way in its favor and decidedly against the analytical theory.

10. Finally be it observed, that grave doubt is cast upon the analytical theory by the suspicious

source from whence it came. That it has been held in most favor by rationalistic critics is not denied. Prof. W. H. Green says on this point: "It is a noteworthy fact that the partition hypothesis in all of its forms has been elaborated from the beginning in the interest of unbelief." Its chief advocates disclaim faith in the miraculous, and even deny its possibility. Such persons must necessarily take such views of the origin of the Pentateuch as will discredit the doctrine of inspiration, and of divine direction and interposition in the affairs of the elect nation. In short, a great deal of the history given in the Pentateuch must be relegated to the realm of myth, legend and fable, and this is the logical and necessary result of the analytical theory. The story of creation, of the fall, of the flood, of Abraham Isaac and Jacob, of Joseph and the Egyptian bondage, of the giving of the law, of the tabernacle, and much if not all of the wilderness experience, are all set aside, being utterly discredited as historical writing. We can readily see how persons holding such views can accept the divisive hypothesis; in fact, it has been used by them to overthrow the traditional belief (so called) as to the origin of the Pentateuch. It has been reserved for us to witness the defense of this theory by professedly Christian scholars, not always, however, in the most radical form, but still in a form preserving its essential features. That many of these men are honest, sincere, devout, earnest men I do not doubt, but how their views of the Bible, of inspiration, of the origin of the Pentateuch, of the nature of the prophetic writings, can be held without utterly destroying Christian faith I do not understand, and

that these views are destructive to faith in many individual cases is certainly true.

The open opponents of the Bible parade the conclusions of the analytical hypothesis as their justification. In short, the theory in its infancy was fostered by unbelievers; it has been vigorously promulgated by unbelievers, and is now used as the weapon of unbelief. I cite the tirades delivered from the platform to-day by rationalistic and infidel lecturers in proof of this statement. There is an adage to the effect that politics makes strange bedfellows; it may be said with equal truth, the analytical theory of the Pentateuch makes strange bedfellows. Infidels set forth the results of the hypothesis as the Gibraltar of unbelief, and Christian scholars parade these same results as evidence that the religious world is coming to a more rational faith. In the meantime, the Christian layman who has been so unfortunate as to have been led by a minister tinctured with the teachings of the divisive critics, experiences a perplexity akin to that of Mary, who said, when she found Christ's sepulchre empty on the morning of the resurrection, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him."

CHAPTER VIII.

The Authorship of the Pentateuch—Testimony Found in the Pentateuch, Historical Books and the Psalms.

So far our argument in favor of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has been indirect. We have assigned reasons which, if sound, would seem to be conclusive against the divisive hypothesis. We will now bring forward some of the direct evidence going to show that the Pentateuch was written by Moses.

I. We will first let the Pentateuch speak for itself on this question.

1. When the book claims a definite authorship, that fact of itself raises a presumption in favor of such claim: nay, more, one of the strongest possible evidences of the authorship of a given production is the direct claim of the writer put forth in the work itself. In fact, such testimony is justly held to be conclusive unless there is unimpeachable evidence showing it to be false.

In view of this fact we are led to inquire: Does the Pentateuch make any claim as to authorship? That the legal portion claims to have been given by God through Moses is not disputed. That claim is put forth repeatedly in the most positive and direct way. A little study of the writing will show very clearly that the claim as to the legal portion involves the historic portions as well. Even a casual examination of the document shows that

it consists of two portions: The historic, extending from the beginning of Genesis to the nineteenth chapter of Exodus, and the legal, extending from the twentieth chapter of Exodus to the close of Deuteronomy, but scattered through this legal portion is also more or less of historic matter. The legal portion is capable of being separated into three clearly distinct, yet closely related, parts.

(1) First in order come the ten commandments, with the accompanying legislation constituting the covenant made with Israel (Ex. 20-23). This was the national charter or constitution, and it was called "The Book of the Covenant." In Ex. 24: 4-7 it is said that Moses wrote this book and read it in the hearing of the people, and it was publicly ratified by appropriate ceremonies, a description of which is given. This was the great covenant to which previous covenants led, and out of which the succeeding covenants logically came. It remained in force until it was displaced by the new, or Christian, covenant. To deny the Mosaic authorship of all of this book of the covenant except the Decalogue portion in a very brief form, and give to it an origin nearly a thousand years beyond Moses' time, is virtually to deny that God made a covenant with Israel.

(2) Now, out of this "Book of the Covenant" there naturally came a second body of laws, pertaining to the sanctuary and ritual. These laws and regulations were not all given at one time, but on different occasions as necessity demanded. It is all declared to have been given to Moses by God, and through him to Aaron and his sons, through whom, of course, it went to the people. It is known in critical discussions as the priest code and makes up no inconsiderable portion of the Pentateuch, occupying Ex. 25 to 31 and 35 to 40, largely the Book

of Leviticus, and the Book of Numbers, being mingled with some historic matter throughout and especially in Numbers.

(3) Next in order comes the Deuteronomic code, which Moses is declared to have delivered to the people, and the year and month when it was done is specified—the eleventh month of the fortieth year of the wilderness wanderings. As introductory to this body of laws there are three addresses of Moses to the children of Israel in all respects suitable to the occasion. The whole situation is reasonable, natural, unstudied, artless. There is not the slightest intimation, in word or circumstance, that the occasion is an imaginary one, invented in all its details seven hundred years after Moses' time. It thus appears that the entire law is Mosaic, if we are to believe the claims it puts forth. Now, the laws in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy are so interwoven with the historic matter as to be practically inseparable. The history explains the occasion of the giving of the laws and thus forms the connecting links. Even the Book of Genesis and the first nineteen chapters of Exodus furnish the history preliminary to the giving of the law, and naturally lead up to it.

(4) In addition to the writing of laws, in two instances Moses is said to have written history, and the account is of such a character as to indicate he was the proper and, by inference, the accustomed historian. He was specially instructed by God (Ex. 17: 14) to record the victory over Amalek, and a still more important case is found in Num. 33: 2, where Moses is commanded by God to write the "goings out according to their journeys" of the children of Israel, which Moses did. The whole chapter is given up to a detailed statement of these journeys. About fifty different stations are mentioned and

occasional explanatory remarks are thrown in. This is a very troublesome chapter to the advocates of the divisive hypothesis. Imagine a man living a thousand years after Moses' time inventing such a chapter as this; drawing on his imagination for the various journeyings, for the stations where the stops were made for longer or shorter periods, for the names of these imaginary stations, and for all the incidents recorded as having transpired at them, and doing all this, not as a fiction, but in the sacred name of truth. Can any one believe for a moment that this was done? To read the chapter is to be convinced that it must have been written by an eye-witness. If answer is made that the final compiler of the Pentateuch may have gotten this material from documents that have been lost, or from tradition, I answer: Why throw away the documents that claim to be Mosaic and then assume that other documents of the same nature may have existed which have disappeared so completely that no trace of them exists? If there were no such documents, but the history as we have it rests on traditions carried down for a thousand years, then it is evident the account has no historic value at all.

This argument may be summed up as follows: The laws of the Pentateuch, constituting a very large part of the document, claim in the most positive way to be Mosaic. Genesis, and the early chapters of Exodus, give the necessary history preliminary to the giving of the law. The later history is very closely interwoven with the legal portions, being plainly connecting links. Moses in two cases is instructed by God to write historic matter showing he was the accustomed scribe. Thus the Pentateuch is seen to be one complete work, of which the legal and historical portions are essential and mutually supple-

mentary parts. If Moses was the author of the legal portion, he was the author of the whole.

2. It must therefore be very evident that those who deny that Moses wrote the Pentateuch contradict the claims as to authorship that the document makes for itself, and this logically carries with it a denial of the inspiration of the document.

Those who take this position urge that it was the custom of antiquity to assign writings to some great name, and that such an act was not regarded as in any sense a violation of moral principle: that, in short, it was not looked upon as a falsehood, and consequently no moral turpitude attached to it. This may all be granted, and yet this fact fails to satisfy the demands in this case. The Pentateuch claims to be an inspired document, and whatever custom may have prevailed in ascribing authorship to uninspired writings it can not apply to inspired writings without making God a party to the fraud. God is virtually accused of accrediting his communications to the wrong person for the sake of the prestige that would thereby be given to them. Who can believe it? Is it not clear that to deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is to deny its inspiration? Such, at least, has been the view of the most prominent advocates of the divisive hypothesis. The theory is most surely the weapon of unbelief.

II. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is sustained by the references made to it in the historical books of Joshua onward.

1. The Book of Joshua makes frequent allusions to it. It opens with the children of Israel just where they were left in Deuteronomy. The conquest of Canaan and its division was carried out according to Moses' orders.

Joshua is represented as having been very explicit and exact in carrying out Moses' directions. In short, the Book of Joshua is based on the preceding books. Those who deny the genuineness of the Pentateuch are consequently compelled to throw Joshua overboard also. They include it with the Pentateuch under the name Hexateuch, explaining the origin of the whole in the same way. In other words, the claim is made that the book of the law when completed, which was about the time of the return from captivity, the final touches being given to it by Ezra, included the Book of Joshua instead of ending with Deuteronomy. Thus the historic character of Joshua is utterly discredited.

2. The Book of Judges makes frequent allusions to events of the exodus and the wilderness march. In chap. 1:10, 20, we read, "And Judah went against the Canaanites that dwelt in Hebron. . . . And they gave Hebron unto Caleb, as Moses had spoken." This is clearly a reference to Num. 14:24, where God commended Caleb for his courageous spirit, and declared his seed should possess the land. In chap. 11:16-18 the exodus is spoken of, the wilderness march is referred to, and the experiences with the kings of Edom, Moab and the Amorites are described. In chap. 2:1-3 there is reference to the deliverance from Egypt, to the covenant made with Israel, to the prohibition forbidding Israel to make covenants with the inhabitants of Canaan, and to the promise of God that he would drive out the inhabitants of Canaan from before Israel. All this is based on the history furnished in the Pentateuch. In chaps. 13:7, 14 and 16:17 reference is made to the Nazarite vow and its requirements. This is provided for in Num. 6:1-5. It is unnecessary to pursue this inquiry further by citing specific references. In almost every chapter

of the book allusions to points of history and items of legislation, found in various parts of the Pentateuch and especially in Numbers, can be found. It is also worthy of note that Israel under the judges was governed in harmony with a Deuteronomic law.

3. In the Book of Ruth (chaps. 3:12 and 4:3, 4) reference is made to the law concerning the redemption of land, as recorded in Lev. 25:25. In chap. 4:5, 10, the law concerning the marriage of a widow by the dead husband's brother is referred to. This law is found in Deut. 25:5, 6. In chap. 4:11, 12, reference is made to Rachel and Leah, wives of Jacob, and to Tamar, wife of Judah, which clearly shows an acquaintance with the story as recorded in Genesis. It is clear, therefore, that the writer of the Book of Ruth was acquainted with both the history and laws of the Pentateuch.

4. The Books of 1 and 2 Samuel also abound in references to the Pentateuch. Chap. 1:11 refers to the Nazarite vow described in Num. 6:5. Chap. 2:13 refers to the Deuteronomic law concerning the portion of the priests.

Chap. 2:27, 28 refers to the choosing of Aaron, and to the Ephod, which shows an acquaintance with Exodus. In chapters 6, 7 and 9 the various offerings are mentioned—peace-offerings, trespass-offerings, burnt-offerings—which shows a knowledge of the whole ritual of worship.

Chap. 12:6, 8 refers to Jacob's going into Egypt, and to the deliverance wrought in answer to the prayer of the oppressed people, which shows an acquaintance with the history given in Genesis. Chap. 15:2, 6 refers to the opposition of Amalek to Israel, the history of which is recorded in Exodus.

2 Sam. 7:6 refers to the deliverance of the children of Israel and to the fact that God dwelt with them in tent and tabernacle and verses 22-24 refer to the redeeming of Israel from Egypt to be the peculiar people of God, all of which clearly refers to the history given in Exodus.

2 Sam. 6: 13-17 represents David as bringing the ark into the city of David in the manner prescribed by Moses for the bearing of the ark, and offerings are made according to the law.

It is needless, however, to burden this chapter further with citations of Pentateuchal material in the Books of Samuel. Only a small portion has been used, but sufficient to clearly show that the Pentateuch was well known to the writer.

5. In 1 and 2 Kings the references to the Pentateuch are very abundant, a fact which is not disputed so far as Deuteronomy is concerned, but the references to Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers are equally as clear. The general plan of Solomon's temple described in 1 Kings is the same as that of the tabernacle described in Exodus; the vessels, furniture, apartments, all show a close resemblance to corresponding things in the tabernacle.

The great feast on the occasion of the dedication of the temple was held at the time and in the manner appointed for celebrating the feast of the tabernacles, as ordained and described in the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus, and the people came to the feast from over the whole land, the extent of which is given just as the limits are described in Num. 34, when God delineated to Moses the boundaries of the promised inheritance.

The ark that had been in the tabernacle is mentioned as containing the two tables of stone put there by Moses at Horeb, where the Lord made a covenant with the

children of Israel when they came out of the land of Egypt.

Finally it is said that the cloud filled the house, and the glory of the Lord was manifested exactly in the manner described in Exodus as having taken place when Moses had finished the tabernacle.

In perfect accord with all this, Solomon was charged to keep the statutes, etc., "according to that which is written in the law of Moses," which shows there was a recognized body of laws known by that title, and that the temple ritual was to be a continuation of that ordained and observed under Moses.

6. In 1 and 2 Chronicles, which were originally one book, reference is made to the law of Moses just as is done in the Books of Kings.

In 1 Chron. 6: 49 we read that Aaron made offering "according to all that Moses the servant of God had commanded." In chap. 15: 15 the Levites are said to have borne the ark "as Moses commanded." In chap. 22: 13 David is represented as telling Solomon that he would prosper if he observed "the statutes and judgments which the Lord charged Moses with concerning Israel."

In 2 Chron. 8: 13 Solomon is represented as performing the service in the temple he had built "according to the commandment of Moses." The offerings of the Sabbaths, new moons and the three annual feasts are mentioned, and references to the law of Moses and the Mosaic ritual are numerous, showing an intimate acquaintance therewith.

7. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, giving the history subsequent to the captivity, make reference to the law of Moses just as the other historical books do. In Ez. 2: 2, Zerubbabel, together with the other priests, is declared to have builded an altar for sacrifice "as is

written in the law of Moses," and chap. 6:18 declares the priests and Levites were appointed in their courses for the service of God in Jerusalem "as it was written in the law of Moses." And chap. 7:6 declares Ezra to have been "a ready scribe in the law of Moses."

Neh. 8:1 represents the people as requesting Ezra to bring "the book of the law of Moses," and verse 18 represents Ezra as reading the book to the people. Chapters 1, 8, 9, 10 and 13 also refer to the law given to Moses or by Moses. Thus it is clear that the historical books from Joshua to Nehemiah make reference to the books of the Pentateuch, and especially to the law of Moses.

To accept the divisive hypothesis means: (1) To discredit the Book of Joshua, making it a mere piece of fiction invented a thousand years after Moses' time; (2) to discredit the other Bible historians on the ground that they deliberately falsify or ignorantly allude to erroneous beliefs current in their time. If the former alternative be accepted, the credibility of the historians is utterly destroyed; if the latter, then of course they did not write by inspiration, and the charge of falsehood, while removed from them, is laid at the door of some one else. And note, too, the very aggravated form of the falsehood. It is not only a misstatement or misrepresentation of facts, but it sacrilegiously misrepresents God, calling him into an unholy partnership in perpetrating deceptions of the most flagrant character.

It is urged that there are some historic statements pointing to a later date for the Pentateuch than that of Moses, but assuming that a few passages may have been added by a later editor, such, for instance, as Gen. 36:31-40, referring to the kings that reigned in Edom before there was any king in Israel (which seems to

imply that it was written subsequent to the period of the judges), and the obituary notice of Moses in the last chapter of Deuteronomy, we have a satisfactory explanation of the difficulties. But it would seem to be better to face any difficulty, howsoever great, connected with the Mosaic authorship, than to face the awful consequences involved in the analytical hypothesis; consequences that even the less radical and more devout advocates of the theory contemplate with serious misgivings, and even with alarm.

III. Passing now to the Book of Psalms, we find the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch clearly indicated.

1. We would not expect references to the Pentateuch in such books as Job, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, owing to the peculiar character and purpose of the writings. They have no occasion or room for historic or legal allusions or references. It may, however, be observed that the spirit and moral tone of these writings, and the evident view of the writers as to the nature and character of God, and the principles of his moral government, are in perfect accord with the ethical and religious temper of the Pentateuch.

But while we would not expect references to the Pentateuch in the books just mentioned, the case is very different as respects the Psalms. This is a book of song, expressive of a wide range of sentiment and emotion. Gratitude, devotion, confidence, joy, yearning after righteousness, penitence, patriotism, and many other feelings, find expression in appropriate poetic form, and hence historic events that inspire such sentiments are very naturally referred to. Furthermore, here we have the subjective feature of religion presented in contrast

with the outward ceremonial aspect, and consequently the law in its subjective application and meaning is brought out. As we might expect, there are many Pentateuchal allusions and references to the law of Moses. The Psalms that are ascribed to David, some seventy-three in number, abound in such references or in the use of passages that clearly show a familiarity with Pentateuchal literature.* The question arises: How is this fact accounted for by the divisive critics, since according to their theory no part of the Pentateuch, as we now have it, came into existence for four hundred years after the last Davidic Psalm was penned, and even the two oldest hypothetical documents, E and J, were not produced for at least a hundred, and possibly two hundred, years after David's time. The divisive critics, however, seem to have no great difficulty in dealing with a matter of this kind. They simply deny to David, on various grounds, the authorship of all but ten Psalms, and some would not grant to him more than half that number. The great body of the Psalms are placed in the period after the exile, and consequently after the Pentateuch was written. We can not here go into a discussion as to how many and which Psalms are Davidic, but let us take those that are commonly accepted by the more reasonable critics as Davidic; namely, the third, fourth, seventh, eighth, eleventh, eighteenth, nineteenth, twenty-fourth, twenty-ninth and thirty-second—ten in all.

Now, if in these practically undisputed Davidic Psalms there are passages that clearly indicate that the writer was familiar with the books of the Pentateuch, then as a matter of course these books were in existence in David's time, and consequently the existence of the

*See "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch," by Prof. W. H. Green, p. 56, for a collection of references.

Pentateuch is carried back five hundred years beyond the time assigned by the divisive theory.

2. An examination of the Davidic Psalms shows that the case just stated hypothetically is an actual fact. That is, many of David's sentiments and phrases indicate a familiarity with the Pentateuch, so much so that his writings were colored and many of his phrases shaped by it.

(1) Ps. 3: 3.

"But thou, O Lord, art a shield about me;
My glory, and the lifter up of mine head."

Gen. 15: 1.

"After these things the word of the Lord came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram; I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward."

(2) Ps. 4: 5.

"Offer the sacrifices of righteousness
And put your trust in the Lord."

Deut. 33: 19.

"They shall call the peoples unto the mountain;
There shall they offer sacrifices of righteousness."

(3) Ps. 4: 6.

"Many there be that say, Who will show us any good?
Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us."

Num. 6: 25, 26.

"The Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee;
The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace."

(4) Ps. 4: 8.

"In peace will I both lay me down and sleep;
For thou, Lord, alone makest me dwell in safety."

Lev. 25: 18, 19.

"I am the Lord your God. Wherefore ye shall do my statutes, and keep my judgments and do them; and ye shall dwell in the land in safety. And the land shall yield her fruit, and ye shall eat your fill, and shall dwell therein in safety."

(5) Ps. 7: 12, 13.

"If a man turn not, he will whet his sword;
He hath bent his bow, and made it ready.
He hath also prepared for him the instruments of death;
He maketh his arrows fiery shafts."

Deut. 32: 23, 41, 42.

"I will heap mischiefs upon them;
I will spend mine arrows upon them;
If I whet my glittering sword,
And mine hand take hold on judgment;
I will render vengeance to mine adversaries,
And will recompense them that hate me.
I will make mine arrows drunk with blood.
And my sword shall devour flesh;
With the blood of the slain and the captives."

Must not fair literary criticism say that the writer who penned these passages in the Psalms had knowledge of the above passages quoted from the Pentateuch?

(6) Ps. 8: 5-8.

"For thou hast made him but little lower than God,
And crownest with glory and honour.

Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of
thy hands:
Thou hast put all things under his feet;
All sheep and oxen.
Yea, and the beasts of the field;
The fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea.
Whosoever passes through the paths of the seas."

(7) Gen. 1: 26, 28.

"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over everything that creepeth upon the earth. And God blessed them; and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."

Can any one doubt that the writer of the first passage was familiar with the second?

(8) Ps. 11: 6.

"Upon the wicked he shall rain snares;
Fire and brimstone and burning wind shall be the portion of their cup."

Gen. 19: 24.

"Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven."

(9) Ps. 18: 13-15.

"The Lord also thundered in the heaven,
And the Most High uttered his voice;
Hailstones and coals of fire.

And he sent out his arrows and scattered them;
Yea, lightnings manifold, and discomfited them.
Then the channels of water appeared,
And the foundations of the world were laid bare,
At thy rebuke, O Lord,
At the blast of the breath of thy nostrils."

Ex. 15: 7, 9.

"And in the greatness of thine excellency thou overthrowest them that rise up against thee:
Thou sendest forth thy wrath, it consumeth them as stubble.
And with the blast of thy nostrils the waters were piled up,
The floods stood upright as an heap;
The deeps were congealed in the heart of the sea."

The last reference is taken from Moses' song of victory after the passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites. The preceding reference from Psalms shows that David was familiar with Moses' song.

(10) Ps. 18: 26.

"With the pure thou wilt show thyself pure;
And with the perverse thou wilt show thyself froward."

Lev. 26: 23, 24.

"And if by these things ye will not be reformed unto me, but will walk contrary unto me; then will I also walk contrary unto you; and I will smite you, even I, seven times for your sins."

(11) Ps. 18: 31.

"For who is God save the Lord?
And who is a rock beside our God?"

Deut. 32: 37, 39.

"And he shall say, Where are their gods,
The rock in which they trusted?
See now that I ever am he,
And there is no god with me."

(12) Ps. 18: 33.

"He maketh my feet like hind's feet;
And setteth me upon high places."

Deut. 32: 13.

"He made him ride on the high places of the earth,
And he did eat the increase of the field."

Also 33: 39, last half.

"And thine enemies shall submit themselves unto thee;
And thou shalt tread upon their high places."

(13) Ps. 18: 44.

"As soon as they hear of me they shall obey me,
And strangers shall submit themselves unto me."

Deut. 33: 29.

"Who is like unto thee, a people saved by the Lord,
The shield of thy help,
And that is the sword of thy excellency!
And thine enemies shall submit themselves unto thee."

Note that in these examples David uses the exact phrases or the exact thought found in the passages cited from the Pentateuch. Can any one regard all this as mere coincidence?

(14) Ps. 19: 7-11.

"The law of the Lord is perfect, restoring the soul,
The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.
The precepts of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart;

The commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes.
The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever;
The judgments of the Lord are true, and righteous altogether.
More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold;
Sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb.
Moreover, by them is thy servant warned;
In keeping of them there is great reward."

Who can read this and believe that David did not have the Mosaic law in mind when he penned it? No one, it seems to me, unless he is so blinded by a theory as to be unable to discern that which is perfectly clear. As Professor Green remarks, the whole Psalm presents the glory of God as revealed in the heavens with the glory of God as revealed in his law, but what law can possibly be meant if not the law of Moses?

(15) Ps. 24: 1.

"The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof;
The world, and they that dwell therein."

Ex. 9: 29.

"And Moses said unto him, As soon as I am gone out of the city, I will spread abroad my hands unto the Lord; the thunders shall cease, neither shall there be any more hail; that thou mayest know that the earth is the Lord's."

Also 19: 5.

"Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me from among all peoples; for all the earth is mine."

(16) Ps. 24: 2.

"For he hath founded it upon the seas,
And established it upon the floods."

Gen. 1: 9.

"And God said, Let the waters under the heavens be gathered, and let the dry land appear.
And it was so."

Where could David have gotten the idea if not from this verse?

(17) Ps. 29: 10.

"The Lord sat as a king at the flood;
Yea, the Lord sitteth as king for ever."

Gen. 6: 17.

"And I, behold, I do bring the flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life from under heaven; everything that is in the earth shall die."

3. We have only examined nine Psalms, all of which are confessedly Davidic, at least with the more reasonable portion of the divisive school, and we have seen that many of the unique phrases of the Pentateuch are used by David, and we have also seen that often he expresses thought strikingly similar to that found in the Pentateuchal passages. Now, if David was familiar with the Pentateuch, we have an adequate and satisfactory explanation of the phenomena presented; but if there was no Pentateuch in David's time, how can these agreements in thought and phraseology be accounted for? If the other Psalms which have commonly been ascribed to David are examined, they present the same phenomena which those examined have shown, which serves to strengthen the argument with those who believe that a

much larger number of Psalms should be ascribed to David than the ones named.

This mode of argument is considered sound in discussing any other literature. Why not here? I believe it is. A writer unavoidably, and often unconsciously, reveals the spirit and more or less of the phraseology of the literature he reads, and especially if he has made it a study. Many of our best writers and speakers have been so saturated by Biblical literature that Biblical sentiments and phrases crop out in all they write and say, and one familiar with the Bible is never in any doubt as to the source of these peculiar sentiments and phrases. The Davidic Psalms present an exact parallel to the illustration just cited. I can see no way of avoiding the force of this unless the examples adduced are held to be mere coincidences, which, to say the least, is very improbable, if not absolutely impossible.

4. In conclusion, upon this branch of the subject permit me to remark that to take all of the Psalms away from David, or even to reduce the number of Davidic Psalms to ten, seems to me to be a procedure not only wholly unnecessary, but very unreasonable. The grounds upon which this is done are oftentimes very frivolous.* That David occupied a large place in the thought, reverence and love of the Hebrew nation can not be disputed. Is it likely that his productions would have been lost? If not, where are they if not in the Psalms attributed to him? If he did no writing, how did it happen that so many productions are ascribed to him? He has, by common consent, been regarded as the father of Hebrew poetry. He has held this position in the minds of his people from a period antedating

*For a helpful discussion of this subject, see "Principles of Biblical Criticism," by J. J. Lias, chapter 7.

the Christian era. How could such an idea ever have gained credence if it had no basis in fact, or at best a very slight foundation, such as would be furnished by at most ten short Psalms? There are Psalms ascribed to David that fit too closely the picture drawn of him in the historical books to be mere coincidences. Read the story of David's great sin against Uriah and Nathan's brave and faithful denunciation, and then read Psalm 51. Is not the correspondence too exact to admit of any doubt as to the Davidic authorship? Other examples equally striking can be cited. Psalm 68 is a song of exultation and joy. Could such a Psalm have been penned by any one soon after the exile, when the nation was in most deplorable condition, materially and politically? The Psalms that are confessedly post-exilic breathe a very different spirit. There is a minor chord in the music, telling plainly the depressed state of mind in which the authors wrote, occasioned by the apparently hopeless condition of the nation. To put the great Psalms of exultation after the exile, such as the one ascribed to David after his victory over Saul, involves, as I verily believe, a psychological impossibility. Another thing to be noted is the fact that here, as elsewhere, the advocates of the analytical theory do not hesitate to contradict New Testament utterances.

Our Lord refers to Psalm 110 (Mark 12:36) as a Psalm of David, and Peter in his Pentecostal sermon makes Psalm 16 Davidic. Neither of these are given to David by even the more conservative school of the divisive critics.

With me the conviction is growing stronger continually that the effort to drag the whole body of the Psalms down to the post-exilic period is superinduced by the needs of the analytical theory, rather than by internal

evidence, historical or otherwise, found in the Psalms themselves. Unless practically all of the Psalms are made post-exilic, the theory of the post-exilic origin of most of the Pentateuch is utterly discredited.

We have now seen that the testimony of the historical books and the Psalms is most positively in favor of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. This, added to the fact that the Pentateuch makes the same claim for itself, ought to have great weight in deciding the question. In fact, such evidence never ought to be set aside by an unproven hypothesis.

CHAPTER IX.

The Authorship of the Pentateuch—Testimony of the Prophetic Books and in the New Testament.

We have seen that the Pentateuch bears witness to the Mosaic authorship in the most unequivocal and emphatic way. We have also seen that historic writers testify to the same fact with no uncertain sound. The Psalms of David seem to be permeated with the spirit and phraseology of the Pentateuch, which fact unquestionably points to an early authorship, and therefore argues for the Mosaic authorship. One class of Old Testament writers remains still to be heard from on this important question. We next inquire:

I. Do the prophetic books furnish any evidence concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch?

We need not come down the line farther than Jeremiah, who wrote about the beginning of the captivity, and subsequent to the reformation under Josiah, 621 B. C., when, according to the analytical theory, Deuteronomy, or at least the legislative portion of it, was first promulgated. Pentateuchal references found in books written after Jeremiah's time, and especially after the exile, would not be admitted by the divisive school as favoring the Mosaic authorship. Of course the direct testimony of prophets, no matter when they wrote, will have weight with those who believe that they spoke as

they were moved by the Holy Spirit, but it will have no weight with those who reject the doctrine of inspiration, except in the emasculated form referred to in previous pages, and references to Pentateuchal institutions and laws in prophetic books put forth after the assigned date of the Pentateuch must therefore pass unnoticed.

But this by no means shuts out testimony from Hebrew prophets that bears on this question.

1. We will let Amos be our first prophetic witness. He wrote in the eighth century B. C., about 130 years before Deuteronomy was written according to the divisive critics, and 250 years before the Pentateuch was completed at the hands of the last redactor.

(1) He seems to have been acquainted with the history of Jacob and Esau, and the perpetual enmity engendered on account of Jacob's sharp practice in obtaining the birthright. It will be borne in mind that Edom is another name for Esau, and the Edomites are Esau's descendants and inherited Esau's dislike of Jacob and his descendants:

Amos 1:11: "Thus saith the Lord: For three transgressions of Edom, yea, for four, I will turn away the punishment thereof; because he did pursue his brother with the sword, and did cast off all pity, and his anger did tear perpetually, and he kept his wrath for ever."

Gen. 25:27-34 gives an account of the manner in which Jacob obtained the birthright, and the reference in Amos shows an acquaintance with the story.

(2) Places rendered sacred by their connection with the fathers of the nation are mentioned in connection with the idolatry of the people, for the sake of the dramatic effect, which shows he was acquainted with the history of the fathers of his nation, as given in Genesis:

Amos 4: 4: "Come to Beth-el, and transgress; to

Gilgal, and multiply transgression: and bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes every three days."

Amos 5: 5: "Seek ye me, and ye shall live: but seek not Beth-el, nor enter into Gilgal, and pass not to Beersheba; for Gilgal shall surely go into captivity, and Beth-el shall come to naught."

(3) He was acquainted with the history of the Exodus and the forty years' wandering in the wilderness. Where did he get the facts if not from the Pentateuch?

Amos 2: 10: "Also I brought you up out of the land of Egypt and led you forty years in the wilderness, to possess the land of the Amorite."

Also 3:11: "Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up out of the land of Egypt."

(4) He knew of Israel's idolatry in the wilderness:

Amos 5: 25, 26: "But let judgment roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream. Did ye bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? Yea, ye have borne Siccuth your king and Chiun your images; the statue of your god, which ye made to yourselves."

Such quotations point to a knowledge of such passages as the following:

Deut. 2: 6: "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."

Also 29: 5: "And I have led you forty years in the wilderness; your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot."

(5) He was acquainted with the story of the giants encountered by the spies sent to spy out the land of Canaan:

Amos 2: 9: "Yet destroyed I the Amorite before them, whose height was like the height of the cedars, and he was strong as the oaks, yet I destroyed his fruit from above and his root from beneath."

This plainly points to Num. 13: 32, 33: "And they brought up an evil report of the land which they had spied out unto the children of Israel, saying, The land, through which we have gone to spy it out, is a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof, and all the people that we saw in it are men of great stature. And there we saw the Nephilim, the sons of Anak, which came of the Nephilim, and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight."

Deut. 1: 20 and 26-28: "And I said unto you, Ye are come unto the hill country of the Amorites, which the Lord our God giveth unto us. Yet ye would not go up, but rebelled against the commandments of the Lord our God; and ye murmured in your tents, and said, Because the Lord hated us, he hath brought us forth out of the land of Egypt, to deliver us into the hand of the Amorites, to destroy us. Whither are we going up? Our brethren have made our hearts melt, saying, The people is greater and taller than we."

(6) He had knowledge of the national feasts, sacred seasons, sacred days, burnt-offerings, meal-offerings, peace-offerings, thank-offerings, freewill-offerings and drink-offerings:

Amos 5: 21, 22: "I despise your feasts and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Yea, though ye offer me your burnt-offerings and meal-offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts."

Amos 4: 5: "Offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving of that which is leavened, and proclaim freewill-offerings

and publish them; for this liketh you, O ye children of Israel, saith the Lord."

(7) He recognized the central sanctuary at Jerusalem as the place where God is localized:

Amos 1:2: "The Lord shall roar from Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the pastures of the shepherds shall mourn, and the top of Carmel shall wither."

This does not agree well with the claim of the radical critics that there was no central sanctuary recognized or known before the publishing of Deuteronomy 621 B. C.

(8) He was acquainted with the law of incest:

Amos 2:7: "And a man and his father will go unto the same maid to profane my holy name."

Lev. 20:11: "And the man that lieth with his father's wife hath uncovered his father's nakedness; both of them shall surely be put to death."

(9) He understood the law concerning Nazarites:

Amos 2: 11, 12: "And I raised up your sons for prophets and your young men for Nazarites. . . . But ye gave the Nazarites wine to drink."

Num. 6:2: "When either man or woman shall make a special vow, the vow of a Nazarite, to separate themself unto the Lord; he shall separate himself from wine and strong drink; he shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of drink; neither shall he drink any liquor of grapes, nor eat fresh grapes or dried."

(10) He knew of the law concerning weights and measures:

Amos 8:5: "When will the new moon be gone that we may sell corn? and the sabbath that we may set forth wheat? making the ephah small and the shekel great, and dealing falsely with balances of deceit."

Lev. 19:36: "Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a hin, shall ye have; I am the Lord your God."

Deut. 25:13-15: "Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small. Thou shalt not have in thine house divers measures, a great and a small. A perfect and just weight shalt thou have; a perfect and just measure shalt thou have, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

After reading these passages can there be any doubt that Amos was acquainted with both the history and the laws contained in the Pentateuch?

2. We will summon Hosea to testify as our second prophetic witness.

(1) He evidently was acquainted with the promise made to Abraham concerning a fleshly posterity:

Hos. 1:10: "Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which can not be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass that, in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God."

Gen. 22:17: "In blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven and as the sand which is upon the seashore." Also 32:12: "And thou saidst, I will surely do thee good, and make thy seed as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered for multitude."

(2) He had knowledge of the exodus and the wilderness experience:

Hos. 2:15: "And she shall make answer there, as in the days of her youth, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt."

Hos. 11:1: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt."

Hos. 13:5: "I did know thee in the wilderness, in the land of great drought."

(3) He makes reference to the idolatry of the people in the wilderness:

Hos. 9:10: "I found Israel like grapes in the wilderness; I saw your fathers as the firstripe in the fig tree at her first season; but they came to Baal-peor, and consecrated themselves like that which they loved."

Num. 25:3: "And Israel joined himself unto Baal-peor; and the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel."

(4) He refers to the destruction of the cities of the plain:

Hos. 11:8: "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee, Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zeboim?"

Deut. 29:23: "Like the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim, which the Lord overthrew in his anger, and in his wrath."

(5) He mentions the peculiar circumstance that happened at the birth of Esau and Jacob, and also Jacob's power with God:

Hos. 12:3: "In the womb he took his brother by the heel, and in his manhood he had power with God."

Gen. 25:26: "And after that came forth his brother, and his hand had hold on Esau's heel; and his name was called Jacob."

(6) He refers to Jacob's wrestle with the angel and to his serving for a wife:

Hos. 12:4, 12: "Yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed." "And Jacob fled into the field of Aram,

and Israel served for a wife, and for a wife he kept sheep."

(7) Israel's idolatry is represented under the figure of prostitution, just as it is in Exodus and Leviticus:

Hos. 1:2: "When the Lord spake at the first by Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredom and children of whoredom; for the land doth commit great whoredom, departing from the Lord."

Ex. 34:15, 16: "Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and one call thee and thou eat of his sacrifice; and thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters go a whoring after their gods, and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods."

Lev. 20:5: "Then I will set my face against that man, and against his family, and will cut him off, and all that go a whoring after him, to commit whoredom with Molech, from among their people."

(8) He shows himself to have been acquainted with the law forbidding sacrifice upon the high places and under green trees:

Hos. 4:13: "They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon hills and under oaks and poplars and terebinths, because the shadow thereof is good."

Deut. 12:2: "Ye shall surely destroy all the places, wherein the nations which ye shall possess served their gods, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under green trees."

How does this fact compare with the claim that prior to the promulgation of the Deuteronomic law, 621 B. C., no one seemed to know it was wrong to offer sacrifice anywhere except at Jerusalem? Hosea seems to have

known of the Deuteronomic law forbidding multiplicity of sanctuaries 250 years before Hilkiah found the book in the temple.

(9) He had knowledge of a very extensive written law which his people had disobeyed:

Hos. 8:12: "Though I write for him my law in ten thousand precepts, they are counted as a strange thing."

Also 8:1: "As an eagle he cometh against the house of the Lord; because they have transgressed my covenant and trespassed against my law."

(10) The holy days and feasts prescribed by the Mosaic law were known to him:

Hos. 2:11: "I cause all her mirth to cease; her feasts, her new moons and her sabbaths and all her solemn assemblies."

(11) Multiplicity of altars is spoken of as sin:

Hos. 8:11: "Ephraim hath multiplied altars to sin: altars have been unto him to sin."

Also 12:11: "Is Gilead iniquity? They are altogether vanity; in Gilgal they sacrifice bullocks; yea, their altars are as heaps in the furrows of the field."

Why was it a sin to multiply altars if there was no law requiring a central altar? This language clearly indicates a knowledge of Deut. 12:5, 8.

"But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come; and thither ye shall bring your burnt-offerings and your sacrifices, and your tithes, and the heave-offering of your hand, and your vows, and your freewill-offerings of your herd and of your flock."

(12) He was acquainted with the law concerning the removing of landmarks:

Hos. 5:10: "The princes of Judah are like them that remove the landmarks. I will pour out my wrath upon them like water."

Deut. 19:14: "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmarks, which they of old time have set, in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit, in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it."

Also 27:17: "Cursed be he that removeth his neighbor's landmark. And all the people shall say, Amen."

It surely is unnecessary to press this witness for further testimony. Many more passages could be introduced showing the writer's knowledge of all the minutia and details of the Mosaic law. Hosea, like Amos, shows himself to have been posted on both the history and laws of his people. Every book of the Pentateuch is clearly called into view. So far as the testimony of the prophetic books bears upon the question under discussion, we might well rest the case here. If Amos and Hosea show by their writings that they were acquainted with the books of the Pentateuch, the date of that document is carried far back beyond the time allowed by the analytical theory, unless practically the whole body of the prophetic writings is made post-exilic, as some of the more radical critics are disposed to do. If the prophets just studied lived and wrote the books that bear their names, before the exile, this fact practically establishes the truth of the Mosaic authorship. At least it shows the existence of an extensive body of literature to which the Pentateuch corresponds, and with which it agrees in its laws and historic facts. I will, however, in concluding the argument from the testimony of the prophetic books, briefly allude to some further evidence furnished by other prophets that may serve to strengthen in the minds of some the position we have taken.

3. Isaiah, who wrote from about 750 to 700 B. C., shows the same familiarity with the history and laws of the Pentateuch that Amos and Hosea show.

(1) He was acquainted with the history of Sodom and Gomorrah, the story of which is recorded in Genesis.

Isa. 1:9, 10. "Except the Lord of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, we should have been like unto Gomorrah. Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah."

(2) He had knowledge of the law forbidding injustice to the fatherless and the widow.

Isa. 1:17, 23. "Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Thy princes are rebellious, and companions of thieves; every one loveth gifts, and followeth after rewards; they judge not the fatherless, neither doth the cause of the widow come unto them."

Ex. 22:22, 23. "Ye shall not afflict any widow, or fatherless child. If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto me, I will surely hear their cry, and my wrath shall wax hot."

Deut. 27:19. "Cursed be he that wresteth the judgment of the stranger, fatherless, and widow. And all the people say, Amen."

(3) He was acquainted with the story of the exodus and the passage of the Red Sea.

Isa. 63:11, 12. "Then he remembered the days of old, Moses, and his people, saying, Where is he that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherds of his flock? where is he that put his holy Spirit in the midst of them? that caused his glorious arm to go

at the right hand of Moses? that divided the water before them, to make himself an everlasting name?"

(4) He was evidently acquainted with the song of Moses recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Exodus.

Isa. 12:2. "Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and will not be afraid; for the Lord Jehovah is my strength and song: and he is become my salvation."

Ex. 15:2.

"The Lord is my strength and song,
And he has become my salvation;
This is my God, and I will praise him;
My father's God, and I will exalt him."

(5) He knew the history of Abraham and Sarah, and hence was acquainted with the Book of Genesis.

Isa. 51:2. "Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you: for when he was but one I called him, and I blessed him, and made him many."

(6) He evidently had intimate knowledge of the whole law—its sin offerings, oblations, incense, feasts, sacred days and seasons, and he also knew that the most punctilious observance of the law divorced from right living had no value in the sight of God.

Isa. 1:11-14. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to trample my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; new moon and sabbath, the calling of assemblies—I cannot away

with iniquity and the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble unto me: I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear; your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes. Cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow."

(7) He recognized but one sanctuary—that at Jerusalem; condemned worship and denounced human altars.

Isa. 4:5. "And the Lord will create over the whole habitation of mount Zion, and over her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for over all the glory shall be spread a canopy."

Isa. 8:18. "Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts, which dwelleth in mount Zion."

Isa. 12:6. "Cry aloud and shout, thou inhabitant of Zion; for great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee."

Isa. 57:5-7. "Ye that inflame yourselves among the oaks, under every green tree; that slay the children of the valleys under the clefts of the rocks? Among the smooth stones of the valley is thy portion; they, they are thy lot; even to them hast thou poured a drink offering, thou hast offered an oblation. Shall I be appeased for these things? Upon a high and lofty mountain hast thou set thy bed; thither also wentest thou up to offer sacrifice."

Isa. 65:3, 4. "A people that provoketh me to my face continually, sacrificing in gardens, and burning incense upon bricks, which sit among the graves, and lodge in the secret places, which eat swine's flesh, and broth of abominable things is in their vessels."

Isa. 17:7, 8. "In that day shall a man look unto his Maker, and his eyes shall have respect to the Holy One in Israel. And he shall not look to the altars, the work of his hands, neither shall he have respect to that which his fingers have made, either the Asherim, or the sun-images."

It is certainly clear that he magnified the temple and altar at Jerusalem and never mentioned worship at other places except to disapprove.

References to the law are by no means scarce. Others might be cited were it at all necessary to the strength of the argument. It is evident that Isaiah, like Amos and Hosea, was familiar with the history, laws and institutions of the Pentateuch.

4. Joel was contemporary with the prophets we have just been studying. It is unnecessary to introduce specific passages to show he had knowledge of the Pentateuch. He makes mention of the drink offerings, meal offerings, feasts, solemn assemblies, and, like Isaiah, he recognizes but one sanctuary.

He speaks of Zion the holy mountain, of calling a solemn assembly in Zion, of God dwelling in Zion his holy mountain, of Jerusalem being holy, of God roaring from Zion and uttering his voice from Jerusalem, but not one word anywhere that justifies the existence of any other sanctuary.

How anybody can read these prophets and then declare that prior to the appearance of Deuteronomy,

621 B. C., a multiplicity of altars was generally recognized with approval, and that we have no intimation anywhere that there was but one divinely ordained sanctuary, passes comprehension.

5. Micah, also a prophet of the eighth century B. C., shows that he was acquainted with the Pentateuch in all of its parts. Every one of its books is brought into view by unmistakable references. He mentions Nimrod, Moses, Aaron, Miriam, the wonders wrought by Moses in Egypt, and the Exodus. He, like Isaiah, deprecates excess of sacrifice, unaccompanied by morality and godliness.

6. I must not omit to call attention to Jeremiah, who wrote in the early part of the sixth century, both before and after the captivity. Those who hold that Deuteronomy was written by some unknown author, a short time before it was discovered in the temple by Hilkiah, and that it was the first book of the Pentateuch, cite the fact that the Book of Jeremiah is full of Deuteronomic matter in proof of their position. They tell us that Deuteronomy was an epoch-making book and exercised a wonderful influence on the life of the nation, which is undoubtedly true. After the book was discovered it greatly influenced the king and nation. The question, however, is this: Had the book been recently written, or was it Mosaic, having for a time dropped out of sight owing to the great apostasy into which the nation had fallen?

We are told that there are eighty-six Deuteronomic passages in Jeremiah, ten times as many as are found in any prophet before his time. Why, it is said, should this be so if Deuteronomy had been in existence since the days of Moses? To this we may reply: First, if there are Deuteronomic passages in

the earlier prophets at all, that book must have been in existence in their day. It is not a question as to whether they have less of such matter than Jeremiah, but, is there any of it in their writings? That there is can not be successfully denied. Second, there are good reasons why Jeremiah should be full of Deuteronomy. His people were about to suffer the awful doom of disobedience to their divinely given laws. The time of punishment was at hand. Well might he cite their disobedience as a reason for the awful retribution about to fall, and in doing so would naturally refer to Deuteronomy. It is not denied that Deuteronomy, and all of the Mosaic law as well, had probably dropped out of sight owing to the terrible apostasy that prevailed during the reign of Manasseh and Amon and for the first eighteen years of Josiah. The repromulgation of the law would therefore have a most startling effect, and Jeremiah could do no greater service than to magnify the long-neglected code.

But the question is suggested: If there is unquestionable Deuteronomic matter in the early prophets, how is this fact accounted for by the advocates of the divisive theory? So far as I have been able to discover, the following explanations are offered: First, some suggest that either the Deuteronomic matter may have been later insertions—that is, passages slipped into the writings of the early prophets after Deuteronomy appeared—or the writer of Deuteronomy may have copied from the prophets. Any one who will carefully read the early prophets will see how utterly absurd these suggestions are. Can any one believe that all the Deuteronomic references found in the earlier prophets could have been

inserted without destroying the unity of the production? Or if the Deuteronomist copied from the prophets, then where did the prophets get the laws referred to? Does not this imply a body of laws to which the Pentateuch corresponds? Others, doubtless recognizing the improbability of these suggestions, prefer to carry forward nearly the whole body of the prophetic writing into the post-exilic period, but in so doing they leave the nation almost entirely without a literature for a period of eight hundred years after the exodus.

But those who argue that the large amount of Deuteronomic material in Jeremiah sustains the critical theory as to its origin, overlook the fact that Jeremiah contains many references to other books of the Pentateuch. If Deuteronomy were the only book referred to by Jeremiah, there might seem to be some force in the argument put forth by the divisive critics, but, unfortunately for their contention, such is not the case. Jeremiah evidently had the whole Pentateuch in his field of vision.

The facts that go to substantiate this statement are: First, the close kinship in thought that certain passages in Jeremiah show two passages in the first four books of the Pentateuch; second, the use of forms of expression almost identical with forms found in those books; third, clear references to the history and laws recorded in those books.

Attention is called to the following comparisons:

(1) Jer. 2:3: "Israel was holiness unto the Lord, the first-fruits of his increase; all that devour him shall be held guilty; evil shall come upon him, saith the Lord." This suggests Lev. 22:10, 15, 16: "There shall no stranger eat of the holy thing. A

sojourner of the priest's, or an hired servant, shall not eat of the holy thing. . . . And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel, which they offer unto the Lord; and so cause them to bear the iniquity that bringeth guilt, when they eat their holy things, for I am the Lord which sanctify them."

(2) Jer. 2:20: "For of old time I have broken thy yoke and burst thy bands." This doubtless refers to the deliverance from bondage and suggests Lev. 26:13: "I am the Lord your God, which brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, that ye should not be their bondmen; and I have broken the bars of your yoke, and made you go upright."

(3) Jer. 4:27: "For thus saith the Lord, the whole land shall be a desolation." This points to Lev. 26:33: "And you will I scatter among the nations, and I will draw out the sword after you; and your land shall be a desolation, and your cities shall be a waste."

(4) Jer. 5:2: "And though they say as the Lord liveth; surely they swear falsely." This suggests Lev. 19:12: "And ye shall not swear by my name falsely, so then thou profane the name of thy God."

(5) Jer. 6:28: "They are all grievous revolters, going about with slanders; they are brass and iron, they all of them deal corruptly." 9:4: "Take ye heed every one of his neighbour, and trust ye not in any brother, for every brother will utterly supplant, and every neighbour will go about with slanders." This points to the law against slander. Lev. 19:16: "Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people, neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy neighbour."

(6) Jer. 7:26: "Yet they hearkened not unto me,

nor inclined their ear, but made their neck stiff; they did worse than their fathers." This suggests a knowledge of Ex. 32:9: "And the Lord said unto Moses, I have seen this people, and, behold, it is a stiffnecked people." Also 33:5: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Say unto the children of Israel, Ye are a stiffnecked people; if I go up into the midst of thee for one moment, I shall consume thee."

(7) Jer. 9:25, 26: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will punish all them which are circumcised in their uncircumcision; Egypt, and Judah, and Edom, and the children of Ammon, and Moab, and all that have the corners of their hair polled, that dwell in the wilderness: for all the nations are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in heart." This points to the Levitical law concerning the trimming of hair and beard. Lev. 19:27: "Ye shall not round the corners of your heads, neither shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard." 21:5: "They shall not make baldness upon their head, neither shall they shave the corners of their beard."

(8) Jer. 9:26: "For all the nations are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in heart." This is suggestive of Lev. 26:41: "If then their uncircumcised heart be humbled, and they then accept the punishment of their iniquity; then will I remember my covenant with Jacob."

(9) He makes a very clear reference to the covenant made with Israel immediately after the exodus.

Jer. 11:2-5: "Hear ye the words of this covenant, and speak unto the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and say thou unto them, Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, Cursed be the man

that heareth not the words of this covenant, which I commanded your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the iron furnace, saying, Obey my voice, and do them, according to all which I command you; so shall ye be my people, and I will be your God: that I may establish the oath which I sware unto your fathers, to give them a land flowing with milk and honey." Ex. 19:5: "Now therefore if ye will obey my voice indeed and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me from among all peoples." This refers to the covenant fully set forth in chapters 20-23.

(10) Jer. 11:5: "That I may establish the oath that I swore unto your fathers to give them a land flowing with milk and honey."

This language shows that Jeremiah was acquainted with the promise of an earthly inheritance and knew of the oath by which Jehovah had bound himself. Gen. 22:16, 17: "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, . . . That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heavens, and as the sand which is upon the seashore." Gen. 12:7: "And the Lord appeared unto Abram and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land." Ex. 3:8: "For I know their sorrows; and I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land into a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey; unto the place of the Canaanite, and the Hittite, and the Amorite." Num. 14:23: "Hearken to my voice; surely they shall not see the land which I sware unto their fathers, neither shall any of them that despise me see it."

(11) He evidently was acquainted with the prophecy concerning the captivity and the deliverance.

Jer. 31:16, 17: "Thus saith the Lord, Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears; for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy. And there is hope for thy latter end, saith the Lord; and thy children shall come again to their own border."

Jer. 15:19-21: "Therefore thus saith the Lord, If thou return, then will I bring thee again, that thou mayest stand before me; and if thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth; they shall return unto thee, but thou shalt not return unto them. And I will make thee unto this people a fenced brazen wall; and they shall fight against thee, but they shall not prevail against thee; for I am with thee to save thee, and deliver thee, saith the Lord. And I will deliver thee out of the hand of the wicked, and I will redeem thee out of the land of the terrible."

This also points to a knowledge of the promise of deliverance. Both passages bring to view:

Lev. 26:41, 42, 45: "If then their uncircumcised heart be humbled, and they then accept the punishment of their iniquity; then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham, will I remember; and I will remember the land; . . . I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt."

Lev. 26:44: "And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not reject them; neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them; for I am the Lord their God."

The purpose of these Scriptures was to inspire hope in the captive.

(12) He makes reference to the horns of altars, showing he had knowledge of the way God's altar was constructed.

Jer. 17:1: "The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron, and with the point of a diamond: it is graven upon the table of their heart, and upon the horns of your altars." Ex. 27:1, 2: "And thou shalt make the altar of acacia wood, five cubits long, and five cubits broad: the altar shall be four-square: and the height thereof shall be three cubits. And thou shalt make the horns of it upon the four corners thereof; the horns thereof shall be of one piece with it: and thou shalt overlay it with brass."

(13) He evidently was acquainted with the commands of the Decalogue.

Jer. 17: 21, 22: "Thus saith the Lord, Take heed to yourselves, and bear no burden on the sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem; neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the sabbath day, neither do ye any work: but hallow ye the sabbath day, as I commanded your fathers." Ex. 20:8-10: "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a sabbath unto the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work."

(14) He refers to the story of Rachel which is recorded in Genesis.

Jer. 31:15: "Thus saith the Lord: A voice is heard in Ramah, lamentation, and bitter weeping, Rachel weeping for her children and refuseth to be comforted for her children, because they are not."

(15) He refers to the law of redemption.

Jer. 32:7, 8: "Behold, Hanamel the son of Shallum thine uncle shall come unto thee, saying, Buy thee my field that is in Anathoth: for the right of redemption is thine to buy it. So Hanamel mine uncle's son came to me in the court of the guard according to the word of the Lord, and said unto me, Buy my field, I pray thee, that is in Anathoth, which is in the land of Benjamin; for the right of inheritance is thine, and the redemption is thine; buy it for thyself."

Lev. 25:25, 48, 49: "If thy brother be waxen poor, and sell some of his possession, then shall his kinsman that is next to him come, and shalt redeem that which his brother hath sold. . . . After that he is sold he may be redeemed: one of his brethren may redeem him; or his uncle, or his uncle's son, may redeem him, or any that is nigh of kin unto him of his family may redeem him; or if he be waxen rich, he may redeem himself."

(16) He refers to the threat of God to visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the children.

Jer. 32:18: "Which showed mercy unto thousands, and recompenses the iniquity of the fathers into the bosom of their children after them."

Ex. 20:5, 6: "For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy

unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments."

(17) He was acquainted with the promise concerning an earthly posterity.

Jer. 33:22: "As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured; so will I multiply the seed of David my servant."

Gen. 15:5: "And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and all the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be."

(18) He refers to God's manner of making a covenant.

Jer. 34:18: "And I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant which they made before me, when they cut the calf in twain and passed between the parts thereof." Gen. 15:9, 10, 17: "And he said unto him, Take me an heifer of three years old, and a she-goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtle dove, and a young pigeon. And he took him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each half over against the other: but the birds divided he not. . . . And it came to pass, that when the sun went down, and it was dark, behold, a smoking furnace, and a flaming torch that passed between the pieces. In that day the Lord made a covenant with Abram," etc.

There can be no reasonable doubt that Jeremiah shows an acquaintance with the whole Pentateuch, and therefore his use of Deuteronomic matter offers no proof of the late origin claimed for that book; but the reference he makes to the other books argues

conclusively against the post-exilic origin of those books.

Notice what a striking situation is presented, according to the most radical school of criticism, in the history and literature of Israel. The great bulk of the historical, prophetical, didactic and devotional literature is given a post-exilic date. This means that the history of Israel for seven hundred years after the exodus is largely a blank. Nay, it means that the whole history of the nation, from its earliest beginnings down to the exile, is a fable; that the great characters so strikingly delineated are for the most part creations of art, inventions of a lively imagination; that the splendid body of literature with which we are familiar suddenly burst forth in all its glory, without roots or beginnings. There is no development shown except in a literature purely hypothetical, no traces of which have ever been found. Moreover, according to the theory, this literature appeared at a time of great national humiliation and decay, long after the golden age politically was past, a period utterly unsuited to the production of a classic literature, thus presenting a phenomenon witnessed in the history of no other nation. On the other hand, the so-called traditional theory makes the golden age of Hebrew literature, very naturally, coincide with the golden age of the nation politically.

I can see how unbelievers, blinded by prejudice and exceedingly mad against the doctrine of the miraculous, can accept such a theory, but, I repeat again, I do not see how professed believers can do so.

In concluding the Biblical argument, I invite attention to:

II. The evidence furnished in the New Testament for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

1. Our Lord bears testimony on this question of the most positive and unequivocal character. In Mark 12:26 he calls the Pentateuch "the book of Moses." In the parable of Dives and Lazarus, recorded in Luke 16, he calls the Pentateuch and the other Scriptures "Moses and the prophets." In Luke 24:44 he refers to the prophecies concerning himself as "written in the law of Moses, and the prophets and the psalms." He said to the leper that he had healed (Matt. 8:4), "Go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded." Mark repeats the same language, chapter 1:44, and so does Luke, chapter 5:14. He said to the Jews (Matt. 19:8), "Moses for your hardness of heart suffered you to put away your wives." Mark makes the same statement in chapter 10:5. In John 7:19, we read, "Did not Moses give you the law?" One might almost be led to conclude that he anticipated the teaching of the divisive critics and condemned it in advance. Language could not be more pointed and direct. If he had had the modern analytical hypothesis before him he could not have contradicted it in plainer terms.

But Jesus spake of Moses not only as the giver of the law, but as having written it. In Mark 10:5, we read, "He [Moses] wrote you this commandment." He also declared that Moses prophesied concerning him (John 5:46, 47), "For if ye believe Moses ye would believe me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"

It was evidently the current belief in the time of Christ that Moses was the author of the books

ascribed to him. Jesus gave his support to that belief in as plain and emphatic a way as language could do it. If the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is a fact and Jesus had wished to confirm that truth, can any one imagine a clearer endorsement than we have in the passages above cited? There are three possible suppositions as respects this question and Christ's attitude to it:

(1) It may be held that Moses did not write the Pentateuch and that Jesus knew it, but accommodated himself to the prevailing view, not wishing to raise an unprofitable critical question. If this were true, was it necessary for him to speak of Moses as the author? Could he not have referred to the law without mentioning authorship at all? Evidently he could have done so. He could have resorted to a circumlocution that would have avoided the question altogether. Would not even an honest man have done this if he had wished to refer to the Jewish law without raising the question of authorship? Does not the fact that Jesus did not do so show that he was not aiming to avoid the question of authorship? In other words, he endorsed the current belief when he could easily have avoided doing so if that belief were erroneous.

(2) The position may be taken that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, but Jesus supposed he did, having ignorantly adopted the commonly accepted error. I for one am unwilling to entertain any such dishonoring view of Him whose divinity I have openly confessed. I fail to understand how such a view can be made to harmonize with the doctrine of Christ's divinity. If he was "God manifest in the flesh," if "in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,"

if "he thought it not a prize to be equal with God," if "the Holy Spirit was given to him without measure," if he was one with the Father and dwelt with him before the world was, if "he knew what was in man," if the future was as plain to him as the present, as is shown by his predictions concerning his death, betrayal, resurrection, the destruction of Jerusalem and many other events; then, if Moses did not write the Pentateuch, Jesus knew it, and his endorsement of the error when he could have easily avoided it is an impeachment of his honesty and truthfulness.

Here again I can see how unbelievers can take such a belittling view of our Saviour, but how devout Christian men can do so I can not understand. To say that Jesus was ignorant on this question makes him inferior in knowledge to our modern critics. They know that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch, but they are not too immodest to say that Jesus was not so well informed as themselves, but ignorantly accepted the Mosaic authorship. Is it not time for Christian men to pause and consider whither they are tending before adopting a theory that robs our King of his crown?

(3) Finally, it is possible to hold that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, that Jesus knew it and made his statements with that fact fully in mind. This is the only view that harmonizes naturally with his language, and this to me seems the only view consistent with a belief in the divinity of our Lord and Master, and if this doctrine be surrendered it matters not who wrote the Pentateuch. Time spent in the investigation is worse than wasted. If this doctrine is accepted, it carries with it, as I verily believe, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

2. It seems to me wholly unnecessary to pursue the New Testament argument further. The testimony of Christ's apostles and other New Testament writers virtually reiterates the statements of the Master on this point. When the law is read they say: "Moses is read." They speak of Moses and the prophets when speaking of the Pentateuch, and the other Scriptures. They say "Moses commanded," "Moses wrote." In short, they give frequent expression to the current belief concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch and there is not the slightest hint in the New Testament, or the Old, for that matter, that any one entertained any doubt on that question. The last Old Testament prophet, Malachi, said, chapter 4:4, "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments." This is a faithful echo of the same voice that comes ringing down through the centuries from Moses' time to Malachi's day. It is caught up by the Master and reiterated again and again by his apostles, and no one dared to raise a conflicting voice, or, so far as we can see, even thought of such a thing.

I believe as firmly as I believe in the divinity of my Lord that the modern divisive hypothesis of the origin of the Pentateuch, in all its forms, is destined to complete and final overthrow at no distant day. It may be the fashion just now, in certain quarters, to discredit the Mosaic authorship, but indications are not wanting that like many another fashion it will soon be a thing of the past, at least to all who believe in Christ or have any reverence for the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

CHAPTER X.

The Authorship of the Pentateuch—Other Arguments for the Mosaic Authorship.

In concluding this discussion I desire to submit a few additional arguments in favor of the Mosaic authorship.

1. A strong argument for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is found in the peculiar and unique character of the Israelitish nation. Every effect must have its cause. National character and peculiarities are the results of the laws and institutions under which the nation has been developed. Roman character is the result of Roman laws and institutions; the one answers to the other. Law is a great educator. He who shapes the laws of a people shapes the national character and life. Spartan character is the result of the laws of Lycurgus.* The laws are an adequate explanation of the peculiar characteristics of the people. No nation exhibits such singular and peculiar characteristics as the Hebrew people. They are unlike any other people. Their great dominant thought, "One true and living God," is unique. Where is the explanation for this marvelously eccentric people? It is found in the laws and institutions of the Pentateuch. Give to Moses the authorship of the Pentateuch and we have an adequate and satisfactory explanation of

* Principles of Biblical Criticism (Lias), pp. 105-106.

every step in the national development, and of every phase of the national life. Bring the Pentateuch forward a thousand years and we have no satisfactory explanation of the peculiar civil and religious polity of that wonderful people whose history is the key that unlocks the world's history; yea, that shows all the great historic events to be but the footsteps of God in his majestic progress toward the accomplishment of his stupendous benevolent design. Adopt the divisive hypothesis of the origin of the Pentateuch, and the Jewish nation is the riddle of all the ages. The more reasonable of the divisive critics say that Moses must be regarded as the founder of Israel's polity, yet their theory makes even his existence problematical and his laws and institutions more unsubstantial than the vagaries of a sick man's dreams.

2. In the next place, the peculiar formation of the Pentateuch furnishes an argument in favor of the Mosaic authorship. The legislation consists of several distinct bodies of laws of such a character as to exactly fit the occasions and circumstances when they were delivered. Wherein these several codes differ, as they sometimes do when bearing on the same matter, the variations are accounted for by the changed circumstances. The historic portions interspersed with the legal parts fully explain the latter and the whole account constitutes a consistent narrative from first to last. Now, I am aware that the peculiar structure of the Pentateuch is used as an argument against the Mosaic authorship. It is held that if the whole body of laws belonged to one period, there would have been an effort at orderly codification, avoidance of divergent laws pertaining

to the same matter, and the elimination of all repetition; but, as just remarked, the various occasions calling forth the legislation spreading through a period of forty years, explain all this. But, on the other hand, the divisive critics, according to their own theory, have the same problem to meet without being able, so far as yet appears, to offer any explanation. If the Pentateuch was produced by several different writers in the manner set forth by them, why did not the last redactor codify the various bodies of laws, eliminate superfluous laws and remove all apparent contradictions or conflicting variations? If the Pentateuchal legislation was enacted, as the history sets forth, we can see just why the form is as it is; but if the analytical theory is true, the lack of orderly arrangement is inexplicable.

But we are told that some of the legislation could not have been enacted in Moses' time, since it clearly was intended to fit conditions that did not then exist and did not come to pass until a much later period, and that consequently those laws could not have been understood in Moses' day. In reply, I cite the fact which is not denied, that some of the laws of Deuteronomy fit conditions in Moses' day, but were entirely out of date in the year 621 B. C., when the critics tell us they were first promulgated. To my mind it is far more reasonable to suppose that Moses, the great leader and lawgiver of his nation, inspired by God for his task, would anticipate the conditions that would obtain when his people would come into their promised inheritance, and provide for these needs in his legislation, than to suppose a lawmaker, writing seven hundred years

after Moses' time, would formulate laws that applied to conditions that had not existed for hundreds of years. It can readily be supposed that a man, writing by inspiration, may anticipate the needs of his people, but why should a man write laws that were out of date by centuries? In answer to this, the critics say that probably the antiquated laws of Deuteronomy had been enacted by some one at an early day, that they had in their time been observed with more or less fidelity, and that the writer of Deuteronomy merely wished to make his code complete by carrying forward the old laws. Surely this was a strange procedure. We are asked to believe that the writer of Deuteronomy burdened his code with antiquated relics which could serve no purpose other than as mere keepsakes, so to speak. For laws and instructions found in Deuteronomy which would be of service only in the early history of Israel, see chapters 4:3, 4; 7:1-6; 8:1; 9:1-3; 17:14-17; 19:1-3; 25:17-19; 27:11-26.

3. The Mosaic authorship is sustained by the writer's point of view. His position is in the wilderness beyond Jordan. He has not yet entered the promised land. He speaks of what will come to pass when the people enter upon their promised inheritance. Jerusalem is never mentioned. The great temple is not alluded to. The enemies to be encountered are not the enemies just preceding the captivity effected by the Assyrians and Babylonians, but the early nations of Canaan.

The laws enacted fit the conditions of the wilderness march.* The people are forbidden to do as the

*See "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch," by W. H. Green, pp. 39, 40.

Egyptians with whom they had recently dwelt, or as the Canaanites with whom they would soon be brought in contact. They are reminded that their rest is future, and many of their laws are framed with reference to their future abode after Jehovah shall have cut off or driven out the inhabitants of Canaan. Even the central sanctuary is to be located where the Lord will choose to place his name. All references to the life of the people indicate tent life or camp life. Even the wood out of which the tabernacle, ark and sacred vessels were made is peculiar, we are told, to the desert. It is called shittim wood. The structure of the tabernacle shows it was intended for a wandering people, and full instructions about how to move it from place to place are given. Many other instructions are given that fit only a migratory people, while there are other enactments that looked forward to the time when their wanderings would cease, all of which accords perfectly with the conditions and expectations of the Israelites in Moses' time. In short, the viewpoint and coloring are pre-eminently Mosaic, but utterly out of keeping with the late period assigned by the divisive critics.

The demand here made by the analytical hypothesis ought to be entirely too great for the credulity of the average man. We are asked to believe that a set of writers carried themselves backward through periods ranging from seven hundred to a thousand years, and so completely, in their imagination, adjusted themselves to the distant age and environment that they wrote extensive productions dealing with peoples, places and conditions in general without making mistakes in geography, topography, ethnology

or in customs, social or religious. If there is such a thing as an intellectual miracle, this is certainly one.

4. Egyptian material is by no means scarce in the Pentateuch. Egyptian words, customs, objects, arts, intrude themselves continually upon the attention of the reader. The life of Joseph, and the history of the residence of Jacob and his descendants in Egypt, are too realistic and artless to have been an invention of late writers. The allusions to Egyptian experiences and customs have all the marks of true reminiscences, and are not simply references to matters that might have been learned from report, or from the intercourse that Israel may have had with Egypt in later ages, as one of the advocates of the analytical theory remarks. The allusions indicate close intimacy and recent acquaintance. The author writes as an eye-witness, and not as one who got his information at second hand.

5. The worship set up by Jeroboam in the northern kingdom, upon the revolt of the ten tribes, has an important bearing on this question. The narrative in 1 Kings 12 represents Jeroboam as saying to the people, "It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem." He thereupon established idol-worship in Bethel and Dan, the two extremities of his kingdom. Is it not plain to be seen that Jeroboam saw that the only way to keep the people from returning to their allegiance to the house of David was to furnish them, not one sanctuary, but two, thus making it convenient for the people? His worship was grossly corrupt, but yet he seems to have shaped it more or less according to Pentateuchal law. Evidently he saw the central sanctuary at Jerusalem would have a great attraction, which must needs be counteracted in some way. This

history strongly suggests the existence of the Pentateuch in Jeroboam's day.

The influence of the Pentateuch in the northern kingdom is also shown by the fact that Hosea and Amos, both prophets of the ten tribes, make appeals to a law and a covenant formed with Israel when the nation came out of Egypt, which can scarcely mean less than the Pentateuchal legislation. Hosea speaks of the law as being written "in ten thousand precepts," which clearly points to the elaborate legislation of the Pentateuch. If this point be well taken, and I fail to see how it can be reasonably called in question, it carries the date of the Pentateuch beyond the date of the revolt, to the time of Solomon at least, and if this point is established, no one would seriously dispute the Mosaic authorship.

6. The efforts to show that the language of the Pentateuch does not harmonize with the early date assigned, have not been successful. President W. H. Harper says: "The argument from the language of the Pentateuch will not settle the case on either side." This is a surrender of the linguistic argument from the side of the analytical theory, but I am not so sure that he is warranted in declaring it has no weight on the other side. Professor Schaff says: "The language of the Pentateuch is, throughout, the Hebrew of the purest period, with no trace of later words, or forms, or constructions, or of the Chaldaisms of the exile." He further says it has certain archaic forms not found in the later writings. Kitto says: "The Pentateuch contains a number of characteristic grammatical formations. . . . The Pentateuch contains also words that do not occur in other parts of the Old Testament. . . . There occur also

characteristic phrases." He cites a number of instances in each case. He finally concludes: "Others have vainly endeavored to find in the Pentateuch, and especially in Deuteronomy, vestiges of a later style. The instances produced by the opponents of the Mosaical origin of the Pentateuch do not stand examination, and are, therefore, unable to counterbalance the weight of argument deducible from the antique expressions of the Mosaical writings."

It would seem, therefore, that the argument based on the language of the Pentateuch stands decidedly in favor of the Mosaic authorship.

7. The character of the teachings of the Pentateuch also support the Mosaic authorship. There is a decided advance in doctrine from the Pentateuch to the prophets. The doctrines concerning the future state, the character of true worship, the Messiah and God's providence, are much more fully expanded in the later Scriptures than in the Pentateuch. This is just as it should be. God adapts his revelations to the advancement of his people. There is a gradual unfolding of truth, a mounting upward to higher and higher levels, as time advances, until the great climax is reached in the revelation of Christ and the teachings of his apostles. I am aware that some of the advocates of the divisive hypothesis deny the existence of such a development. They claim that the religious ideas of the Pentateuch are far too much advanced for the Mosaic age, and assert that they are measurably on a level with the ideas of the prophets, but the case seems too plain for dispute. Bible students have ever recognized the elementary character of the doctrines set forth in the Pentateuch as compared with the deep spiritual con-

ceptions as set forth in Job, Psalms and the prophets. The contention of the divisive critics on this point grows out of the doctrine of evolution, which underlies their whole theory. Those who believe in revealed religion, as opposed to evolved religion, have no trouble in seeing just such an advance in religious ideas as might be expected. It is true the religious conceptions of the Pentateuch are too much advanced to comport well with the idea that religion is an evolution beginning with fetichism and advancing through polytheism and henotheism to monotheism. But those who believe in revelation are prepared to begin with monotheism and then advance to ever-enlarging and more spiritual conceptions of the one true and living God, and to more adequate notions of his providence and character. In short, they are prepared to accept just that sort of development they find beginning with the Pentateuch and proceeding through with the prophets, and ending with Christ and his apostles. This is a development as reasonable as it is beautiful, while the other is grotesque, fanciful, and unsupported by the facts of Bible history, and would require us to deny to the Pentateuch any real historic value.

8. If the divisive theory of the Pentateuch is true, it stands as one of the most remarkable facts in all history that it was not discovered until recently, and that, too, by the enemies of the Bible. All the great theologians and scholars of the early Christian centuries, devout and reverent though they were, failed to discover it. All the students of the law prior to the time of Christ overlooked a most wonderful fact as to the nature of that law, revolutionary in its character. All the scholarship of the world, even

down to a comparatively recent date, acute, painstaking, honest and fearless though they were, were unable to find out how the books of the Pentateuch were really produced. It remained for an infidel Frenchman to bring to light the truth concerning the nature of the books that are the basis of all subsequent Old Testament writings and even of the New Testament Scriptures. Who can believe it? Alas! strange to tell, some who claim to reverence the Scriptures, and even to regard them as inspired, accept the theory wrought out by the opponents of the Bible and promulgated in the interest of unbelief. When I hear of apparently reverent Christian scholars accepting and defending these grotesque theories of the enemy, and then claiming that their reverence for the book is thereby increased, I stand amazed and perplexed beyond measure. I feel that I face a difficulty hard to explain, and I would experience a great anxiety over the situation did I not find myself in the company of many devout, serious, capable Christion men and scholars of repute.

9. All late research tends to strengthen the old and commonly accepted theory. I here introduce a quotation from the "Cyclopædia of Religious Knowledge," edited by Sanford (article, "Pentateuch"):

"Archæology supports the historical genuineness of the Pentateuch. The late discoveries of the Egyptian Exploration Society, and all that has been deciphered from monuments throwing any light on the subject, tend to establish the authenticity of the history. The route of the Exodus is confirmed by Professor Palmer and M. Naville. Such an able

Egyptologist as Mr. Reginald Stewart Poole declares that the most recent discoveries and interpretations of hieroglyphics distinctly favor the antiquity of the Pentateuch. Egyptian names are given more correctly in the Pentateuch than in the later histories, and the details are true to Egyptian life."

I have protracted this argument far beyond the limits I intended when I began. It is in no sense a critical discussion. I have aimed to put the arguments for the Mosaic authorship in a popular form, so that they can be readily understood by the average reader. I have drawn freely upon such sources of information as were available to me.

For a list of authorities, see end of volume.

PART III.

The Book of Beginnings.

CHAPTER XI.

Beginnings as Revealed in Genesis—The Beginning of the Material Universe and of Man.

The name "Genesis," given to the first book of the Old Testament, is a wonderfully suggestive title. It comes from the Greek *genao,* to beget, and means origin, generation. The name is singularly appropriate because of the important beginnings of which the book treats.

The first necessary idea in order to the understanding of this book is the idea of God. I do not mean that we must try to define him, nor do I mean that we must comprehend him. We believe in much we can not comprehend. There must always be a starting-point in every investigation or study. The starting-point here is God. Does some one say, How do I know there is a God? Suppose I were to say the Bible says so. You would say, "But you agree not to begin with revelation, but with God." Am I therefore balked in the start? By no means. I may ask, Is the God idea a sufficient explanation of all things, or is there a better and more satisfactory explanation? If not, who can blame me for accepting the best explanation that has ever been offered? Need I hesitate because the idea is mysterious? Need I wait to solve a thousand speculative questions about God before accepting him? An illustration may help us just here. I wish to go to New York, but I do not

know the way. Some man hands me a guide-book. Three courses are open to me. I may say, Where does the man live who made this book? What is his size, weight, mental characteristics, etc., or I may say, What right had any man to make a book? Who gave him authority? Or I may try the book and see if it brings me to my destination. This is the way we proceed in this case. There is a physical world, animal world, intellectual world. Will the idea of God account for all this? Will this idea serve as guide-book to conduct us safely to the end of our journey of enquiry? I answer yes. This idea is all-sufficient.

There is far less mystery with God in the mind than without God. One says, I can not understand the idea of God. It is too mysterious. But the universe is here; man is here. Is it less of mystery without God? The very idea of God has done more to solve this mystery than ever was accomplished in the laboratory of the chemist. Some one may say the God idea does not explain everything. It does not explain itself. It does not account for the one great mystery. Do the natural sciences explain all? Does not the scientist come to the stopping-place? Is it any more mysterious to stop with an intelligent God than to stop with dead matter or with some primordial form of life whose origin is unknown? To me the latter is far more mysterious. In fact, by accepting the God idea I trade off a thousand mysteries for one great mystery that explains all things. With these introductory words let us pass to the study of "Beginnings." *

*In Parker's "People's Bible," in the early chapters of the volume on Genesis, suggestive thoughts are found which have been utilized in this and subsequent chapters. We recommend the reading of this volume.

I. First of all, we find in this book a history of the beginning of the material universe.

1. The opening clause, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," is wonderful in its sweep.

These words are worthy to stand at the opening of such a book. Note how comprehensive it is. The question raised and answered is, not who made a world or a solar system or man, but who made all things. It is matchless for simplicity and also for its sweep. Here is sublime audacity. It is just what we would expect of conscious infallibility. What self-confidence! No hint of doubt or possible mistake.

How true is this to the rules of highest composition. Horace's maxim was, "Rush at once into the midst of affairs." Here is a case in point. In a single sentence the great subject of creation is introduced, and we find ourselves truly in the midst of affairs.

2. This manner of beginning a revelation meets a just expectation.

Some statement as to the origin of things ought to occur at the opening of a divine revelation. The situation demands it. Man naturally asks this question, Who made this universe? Who made all things? Who made me? The house did not make itself. Did the tree? The watch did not make itself. Who made the maker?

3. Certain great and necessary inferences are suspended on this assertion. If this statement is true, then:

(1) The universe is not eternal. Do you see the heavens? God made them. Do you see the trees? God planted them. Do you see the animals? God's plastic hand shaped them. Science logically leads to the same conclusion: it points to the fact that earth is a develop-

ment. This implies a beginning and something to develop and a law of development.

(2) Then, creation is the product of intelligence: "God created," "God saw," "God blessed." Personality, mind, intelligence, lie behind all. Contrast this with the language of man, "The universe is eternal," "The universe came by chance," "God and the universe are one." Which answer must we say came from heaven? The voice of the created world blends with the voice of revelation as is expressed in the words of the Psalmist, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork."

The adaptation of means to ends, everywhere seen, also adds corroborative testimony. The light is adapted to the eye, the lungs to the air, the bird to the atmosphere, the fish to the water. Does not this point to an intelligent Creator? When the sacred writer says, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," he hands us the key that fits the lock, he gives us the answer that meets the conditions and circumstances as we see them and know them. In short, it is just such a statement as our own reason and intelligence demand.

(3) Then God governs and sustains. How restful this. We are not driftwood on the ocean. If he created, is he not interested? How harmonious is all revelation at this point. "In him we live and move and have our being." "He upholds all things by the word of his power." This is the voice of Scripture. If God created, then I may rest contented. He will not forsake me if I do not forsake him. I may rest in peace, assured that the everlasting arms are beneath me. Whatever may fall to my lot, whether joy or sorrow, prosperity or adversity, I may confidently believe that "all things work together for good to them that love God."

(4) The student of God is, then, the greatest of all investigators, because he is occupied with the study of the greatest subject. Some minds incline toward astronomy, some toward botany, some to one thing and some to another. All are entitled to credit, and get credit, for the work of their choice. When another type of mind seizes on God, shall it be sneered at as weak as is the fashion with some? But says one, God is unknowable. Is not the same true of nature, in fact, of everything? At best we only skim the surface of things. Our knowledge at best is superficial. We name mysteries and call it science. But if God has revealed himself, he is not unknowable within the constitutional limits of the human mind. We may not comprehend him in all his fullness, but we may know him so far as the finite may know the infinite, and our knowledge may be a growing knowledge. We may know him better as we study him more.

4. This answer connects the material and spiritual.

There is something more in the universe than matter. Behind all material things there is a spiritual reality. Matter is not first, but spirit. Spirit is not a manifestation of matter, but matter is a manifestation of spirit. Spirit is the eternal entity. Back of the visible there is the invisible, that is even more real than the things of sense. God is spirit; God created, therefore spirit antedates matter.

5. We learn also from this record that creation was progressive. (Gen. 1:3-26.)

(1) The various steps are disclosed: Light; the firmament; water and land separated and earth covered with vegetation; sun, moon and stars; animal life such as is common to the sea (the lowest forms), also fowls; cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth; man

made in the divine image. This is the order according to revelation.

(2) Here, again, we are met by the corroborating testimony of the material world. Scientific research shows creation was progressive. All the time science demands can be given. "In the beginning." How sublime and far-reaching in point of time. This record concerns itself not so much with dates as with truth. Let science fix the dates, if it can, still the truth remains unshaken. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

6. This account gives us certain lessons concerning God's personality.

(1) God's sovereignty and power. God said, "Let there be light." He had all power. No one directed him. There were no limitations upon him. Man has created nothing. He is merely a modifier, an enquirer, an investigator, a namer of things; creator he never is.

(2) God's wisdom. What grander revelation of wisdom than the universe? Thought is everywhere revealed. How complicated the plan. How mighty in sweep. In wisdom how divine.

(3) God's beneficence. "Seedtime and harvest shall not fail." "He giveth to all, life and breath and all things." Provision is made for all. He feedeth the young ravens when they cry. Not a sparrow falls without his notice.

(4) God's eternity. Something is, therefore something always was. That eternal entity is God. Is it not easier to believe in an eternal God than in eternal matter without God?

7. It is very instructive to note the peculiar characteristics of this account.

(1) This account is marked by its strictly religious

character. A naturalist would doubtless have begun very differently, because men begin their revelations from the man side of things. Moses began this revelation from the God side. He began at the fountain and not at the stream. We do not blame the physiologist for beginning at the man side. Do not blame Moses because he began at the other side. His purpose is religious. The purpose determines not only the place of beginning, but the manner of treatment.

(2) It is an account in germ or seed merely. Moses does not pretend to have exhausted the subject. He gives us a skeleton rather than a completely elaborated account. The geologist says the word "day" must mean ages. So let it be. This in no way affects the truth of the account. Again, we are told that things were not made just as they now appear; that various forces have contributed to produce existing conditions; that forces acting from within and without have modified and changed. This is all true, and yet it in no way affects the integrity of the account. Moses leaves room for all natural agencies to play their part in the production of the grand result. There is no conflict between Moses and science, unless men foist upon Moses their own opinions and interpretations, or accept scientific conclusions that have not been verified.*

(3) This account is not fantastic or unreal. It seems to be in marvelous harmony with things as we see them and know them. Land and water, day and night, moon and sun, plants and animals, these are things that come within the range of our observation; they all lie within the scope of our faculties for knowing; there is nothing with which we are not familiar.

(4) Note also that this account is amply sufficient. It is not enough to be a simple account; not enough to

* See Chapter XVI. for fuller discussion.

be sublime. It must be adequate. It meets the requirements of geology as to time, of evolution as to germ. In this statement I do not commit myself to the theory of evolution—certainly not to atheistic evolution. Evolution in any form must have its beginning point—its primal form or germ. Even if the hypothesis of atheistic evolution be granted, namely, that progress from lower to higher is accomplished by means of resident forces, the God idea is not thereby destroyed. The question remains, Who made the germ? Who placed within it its resident forces? The agnostic may say we do not know. By this declaration he is estopped from denying the Bible statement. This account says God made it. It is an amply sufficient explanation and its truth can not be denied. All the most skeptical can say is, "We do not know."

(5) It has the boldness of truth. It is bold to say everything has a beginning, but truth is bold. Its statements are not speculative. They are not hypothetical. They are declarative, positive, emphatic, dogmatic. Error or ignorance hesitates and falters, and speaks uncertainly and with downcast eyes. Truth lifts its head with confidence and speaks with assurance. This is strikingly illustrated in the utterances of Jesus of Nazareth. He has been criticized for his dogmatism, but how could he speak otherwise since in him dwelt all the fullness of God? He could not reason tentatively from the known to the unknown, since there was to him no unknown save the one thing he mentioned that for some mysterious reason was hidden from him. He could not speak hypothetically, but must necessarily speak declaratively. He was the conscious incarnation of truth, and must needs speak with all the boldness of truth.

II. This is also a history of the beginning of humanity.

1. This book never seems to grow weary of exalting the being we call man.

The effort in his behalf shows his importance. Man is the center of all the movement. Man is the beneficiary of every scheme. Man is the object of deepest solicitude and tenderest regard. All this preparation and continued effort is for his sake. The creation of the material world was for the sake of providing a theater for man's actions where he might perform a certain function in his own development in accordance with the plan and purpose of God. The greatness of the stage and scenery indicates the greatness of the actor.

2. Man is greatly exalted in the account given of his origin.

He is not a being of chance. No matter where or when he started, God created him. Not only so, but he put upon man his own image. Joseph Parker calls this amazing audacity. He says in substance, Would an artist dare to claim every painting or sculptured image? Would the music composer dare to claim every song? Yet the Bible says God made man in his image; sinful man, cruel man, plotting man, foolish man, corrupt in mind and body. This being was originally made in God's own image, however much it may have been defaced.

Perhaps, after all, we have never seen man. Oh, could we see with God's eyes; see the man within; see the real man, the possible man; it would be an inspiring, ennobling sight. This fact should kindle lofty aspirations and incite to noblest endeavor. God is my Father; shall I demean myself? I am the child of a King. Shall I show myself worthy of my royal origin?

3. Man is also highly exalted as to design and function.

He was never made to be a slave, but to be a ruler. (Gen. 1:28.) And yet how few really free men there are. The masses are slaves, but it is their own fault. God made man to be free and to have dominion.

How sad that man should consent to be a slave when freedom is his natural right and divinely given prerogative! How strange that man should prefer slavery to freedom and even love his degradation and hug the chain that binds him! Yet it is true, sadly true, that many lose sight of their God-given heritage of freedom, and are content to be slaves and sink continually to lower and baser conditions. Oh, child of the King, awake, put on thy strength, and break the shackles that bind you. Lay hold upon your liberty and exercise your appointed dominion.

4. The change in phraseology is calculated to heighten our conception of man's importance.

The account is invested with peculiar grandeur. Read Gen. 1:1-26. God said, "Let there be light," "Let the water bring forth," "Let the earth bring forth," etc. He now apparently grows meditative and says, "Let us make man." Whatever may be said as to the idiom, let us allow to this language its suggestive force. Must more than one work in this undertaking? If so, who is this partner? I do not know. After all, it may be God alone. This may be the plural of dignity, or it may be God, the Son and the Holy Spirit which some have suggested—which is, in reality, the same thing. This, however, I do know, that man is in a sense a partner in his own making. Man is now in process of being made. God shaped him, Christ redeemed him, the Spirit sanctified him. Ten thousand agencies are at work on

him. If I am still being made, have I nothing to do? Am I not a partner in my own making? If in my case a man is to be made, must I not co-operate with God in the making?

5. This view of the case magnifies man's responsibilities a thousand-fold.

I am admonished to join hands with the great artificer in my own making. I am invited to enter into partnership with God in the accomplishment of the noblest work that can be done.

The appeal is to be a man, a real man, a worthy man, a man in God's image and likeness. Will I live or die? Will I go up or down? Before every one is set life and death, the loftiest possibilities or the deepest degradation.

It is here we catch the glimpse of the divine image when we see the man who has caught the inspiration arising from consciousness of divine origin, abashed, ashamed of sin, yet with upturned face. All honor to the man who aspires to a high destiny.

6. If we fail to catch the image of God in man as he is, there is one place we can see it.

Do you want to see what God looks like? Do you turn with disgust from man? Let us then gaze on the picture Jesus gives. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." In him we see the harmony of his attributes, the sublimity of his purpose, the depth of his pity, the scope of his wisdom, the perfection of his character.

Here, also, we see a man; the perfect image; the man as God would have him; the human married to the divine; the goal of a continually ascending humanity.

"It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."

CHAPTER XII.

Beginnings as Revealed in Genesis—The Beginning of Family and Business Life.

1. Man is pre-eminently social in his disposition.

Hermit life is incompatible with man's nature and disposition. The hermit is an unnatural product. He is a freak, a curiosity, an abnormal development. Natural persons like company; they must have the association of their fellows to be happy. Solitary confinement is the severest punishment. Man is constitutionally social, and to deny him the association of his fellows is to outrage his social nature. The hunger for companionship must be fed. The craving for society is as insistent as the craving for food. Both are constitutional, and were intended by the Creator to be gratified in a proper and reasonable way.

2. The family is the social unit.

It is the fundamental institution. It has received the highest sanction of heaven and earth. It is the source of man's choicest blessings, the fountain of his purest, deepest pleasures.

In the Book of Genesis:

I. We have a history of the beginning of family life.

And the Lord said, "It is not good for man to be alone." The reason is plain. Man was created for

companionship. As the eye delights in light, the ear in sound, so the social propensity demands company, and it is therefore not good for man to be alone.

1. God is always studying man's good.

It is very interesting to inquire how God will accomplish this immediate good for which he seeks. Man is lonely. He needs companionship. As an individual he is not self-sufficient. How shall the defect be remedied? Three courses are possible:

Leave him in solitude. This would, however, be an outrage on man as he is now constituted. It would not remedy the defect. It would break off the creation of humanity at the middle point. It would be a constitutional injustice; man has a social nature that demands satisfaction. To leave him alone would be to introduce a discord into nature. Solitude often means insanity or suicide. God could no more leave man alone than he could create eyes without light or ears without sound.

Make another man for companionship. Such a thing is conceivable, but this would also introduce discord. Man, as has been remarked, is not complete in himself. One man can not supplement the deficiencies of another man. Men when put by themselves either kill each other or descend continually to lower and baser conditions. This is one reason why an army is so demoralizing in its tendencies. This is why all male aggregations are, as a rule, corrupt. Something is lacking for highest, best and purest conditions, whether the body be political, social or educational in its nature.

Create a woman for his companion. Here is the divine solution of the problem. Woman was endowed by her Creator so as to fill up that which is

lacking in man. Woman is God's answer to man's craving for companionship; hence woman is necessary to keep society in a healthy condition. Womanhood saves the social order. What would the world be without her? School, church, state, all need her. Woman is the pillar of society. After thousands of years of development we are just beginning to appreciate this truth of revelation, "It is not good for man to be alone." This convinces me that the Bible is a revelation as well as a development.

2. Then it follows that the family is a divine institution.

This conception was born in heaven. The family is divinely ordained. This is God's first church. If there is any place more sacred than another, here it is found. Here let virtue reign supreme. Here alone souls are sure of one another. Here the heart is laid bare, the mask is laid aside. Here is the most sacred altar ever reared; happy they who keep the fire that God has kindled ever burning. The flame of disinterested love is the only fire that should burn on this altar, and this is divine.

3. It is possible to change this paradise into a very hell itself. This may be done by:

Infidelity. It is a significant fact that our Saviour made this the sole ground for dissolving the marriage relation. God pity the home where virtue is lacking in either partner to the marriage bond. It is in truth a paradise lost.

Cruelty. When this is practiced, the guilty party is surely lacking in the first qualification for entering the marriage relation; namely, love. Where love reigns, cruelty is impossible. Love is the golden chain that should bind hearts together, and no ques-

tions of expediency are so great as to take the place of this.

Peevishness. How silly, how contemptible, and yet, alas! how often seen. Fuming, fretting, worrying about little, inconsequential things, banishes happiness from the home and makes it a place of torment.

Jealousy. When this green-eyed monster stalks into the home, happiness necessarily departs. Some, alas! are so jealous in nature and disposition that they are a torment to themselves, and become obnoxious to their companions, for there is nothing more unlovely than jealousy. It is the parent of envy, falsehood and injustice in a thousand forms.

Ingratitude. How despicable a thing is this. How unbecoming a child, a husband or a wife. Home is the place, of all others, where love rears its altar and offers its victim for the sake of its loved ones. The true father or mother or child stands ready to die for the loved ones, and many of them do die daily, so to speak. What good word can we speak for the ungrateful recipient of this sacrifice?

Intemperance. If the above have slain their thousands, surely this has slain its tens of thousands. This has been the fruitful cause of more woe than all other causes combined, because it is the parent of nearly all other evils that afflict the home. There is scarcely a fireside in all our land where this terrible dragon has not left its slimy track. In the person of father or son, and sometimes in the person of wife or daughter, this demon has entered the home to destroy its peace. God save us from this monster evil should be the prayer of every lover of home, and is it too much to say his prayer should be

supplemented by the ballot he casts? In short, should not every one vote as he prays?

In truth, there is no more blessed, happy place than the virtuous, peaceful home, and, on the other hand, there is no more terrible place of torment than the polluted, desecrated home.

4. Note how exalted the Bible makes the creation of woman.

This Book never enslaves woman. "Children, obey your parents." "Honor thy father and mother." "Husbands, love your wives." This is the Bible view.

Jesus honored women. They were his intimate followers. His tenderest words were spoken to and in behalf of woman. The same is true of apostles. "In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female."

To Christianity belongs the credit and honor of striking the shackles from the hands of woman and lifting her to her divinely appointed place as the helpmeet of man. If this has not yet been fully realized, it at least seems in a fair way of accomplishment. God grant that she may be content to exercise her divinely intended functions, and not seek to fill the place for which man by nature and divine appointment is intended to occupy.

Much has been said about the "rib story," but this account is highly creditable to woman. There is nothing dishonorable here. It places woman one remove further from common clay. It is a sort of double refining process that is described, as some one (was it Joseph Parker?) has said; and may we infer from this that she is not quite so coarse and gross in her nature as man? Surely, at least, the contrary is not suggested by this account of her creation.

From this account several important conclusions come: (1) Woman is a part of man. She was not built up independently like two separate men might have been, and therefore she is not independent of man, nor is man independent of her. (2) Woman and man taken together make the complete divine conception. Humanity is a dual unit, so to speak. Man taken alone is only a fraction. The same is true of woman. "They twain shall be one." (3) She came as a glad surprise. It always has been so. She is prepared for man by God. "A good wife is from the Lord." Suddenly Adam recognizes a companion. She was the divine answer to Adam's need.

5. The divine idea of the family is one man and one woman.

Polygamy and polyandry are contrary to nature, revelation and normal inclination. God did not make one man and many women, nor one woman and many men, but he made a pair and he made both one. The New Testament emphasizes this idea, "Let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband." If polygamy is tolerated in the Old Testament, it is not sanctioned as a fixed and permanent institution. It was permitted like some other things, because of the hardness of men's hearts, and in the meantime its evils were reduced to a minimum pending the introduction of a higher and better order to be realized in the new institution.

It may be well to remark in this connection that it is wrong to secularize marriage. Marriage is not merely a civil rite, it is a divine institution. It is a holy relationship that is entered into by the contracting parties. Its purpose is divine. "It was ordained by God for human happiness, and he has blessed it

and made it sacred by the solemn sanctions and sacred obligations of his word."

6. Woman is the climax of creation.

She was made last. In moral perceptions she stands the peer, if not the superior, of man. In heart power she stands pre-eminent. Is man stronger physically? Yes, but the lion is stronger than he. Is he stronger intellectually? It may be, but Satan is still stronger in this respect. We worship intellect too much. This is one of the curses from which as a nation we are suffering to-day. We have magnified smartness and minimized goodness. We have exalted intellect to the neglect of heart power. The result is a carnival of graft that is appalling.

In her powers of sympathy and affection, in her purity and adherence to principles, in her devotion to duty and in her self-sacrifice, in her patience under suffering and in her forbearance, woman occupies a lofty place. Reverence for womanhood is the salvation of any people. Is it any wonder that the chivalrous man is always and everywhere admired?

II. We find in this book a history of the beginning of business life.

1. Work, business, employment is a divine institution. God gives it the sanction of his own example. He worked and then rested. There is nothing in the narrative of creation more impressive than the divine activity. Jesus sanctioned it by his example. At twelve, he said: "I must be about my Father's business." He also said: "The Father hitherto works, and I work." Christ led a most active life. Morning, noon and night was sanctified by some beneficent ministry. Christianity sanctions

labor, yea, enjoins it. "Diligent in business" is the apostolic injunction. A lazy man can not be an ideal Christian man.

2. This invests labor with wonderful dignity. It is honorable in the highest sense. The idea that labor is dishonorable has ever cursed the world. It curses society wherever it exists. It never fails to curse the individual who entertains it. It is strange that such an idea should ever have gained currency. Rest assured it is from beneath. Whatever tends to degrade labor is necessarily evil. One of the bad effects of slavery grows out of this fact. The serfdom of the Middle Ages had the same tendency. The wage system of the present day can not be the final solution of the labor problem for the same reason.

3. Labor seems to have been a great necessity. The first thing that God did after creating man was to plant a garden and put man into it to dress and keep it. This shows that labor was not imposed as a curse. God planted the garden before man fell. Doubtless man was put into the garden to dress it because labor is a condition of growth and happiness. Labor, like any other blessing, may be abused. It may be made so excessive as to become a curse. It is estimated that if everybody worked four hours per day, all the reasonable wants of men could be met and satisfied. The trouble in our economic system is that many do not work at all. Many others waste their earnings; this means that some must perform more than their just share of the world's work. For every idler somebody must do double work. But it should ever be kept in mind that a reasonable amount of work is a blessing.

It follows, therefore, that no man does a worse thing than to lift his child above the necessity of labor. Poverty may often be a blessing rather than a curse, because it may necessitate labor which would otherwise be avoided. This is the reason why poor boys, as a rule, make the best men.

4. This account ought to bring God very close to us. I labor and toil, but my Father also works. There is a very human word here, "God rested." How sweet the word "rest" is to a tired man. How near it brings God to us to say that he rested. Without this word a great distance would seem to intervene between us and God. He is so great in creation, so powerful, so wise, that he seems to be removed an immense distance from us. This word "rested" seems to bridge the chasm.

5. The true idea of work is the co-operation of God and man. In fact, there is another beginning, that of human and divine co-operation. God planted, man was to till. Here is partnership. It is always a blessed thing for man to remember that he is in partnership with God. This fact clearly points to the dignity and greatness of man. God does some things, man does others. The things God does are impossible to man. Happy is the man who keeps on the human side and does the work that belongs to man without worrying himself with the things that belong to God. It should, however, be kept in mind that this partnership does not involve ownership. Adam tilled God's garden. The same is true yet. We are only stewards, not proprietors. Sometimes we get to be very vain. We can modify and change, hence we feel elated. It is God who does the fundamental things. He creates the germ, and

causes it to grow. He gives light, heat, time, opportunity. In short, he supplies the prime necessities.

6. God shows himself to be a generous, magnanimous partner. He provided a fruitful, beautiful garden. There was everything to gratify man's sensuous nature and meet his intellectual and spiritual wants, for the latter even the companionship of God. He invested man with wondrous power and skill. We can not blame God for man's failure. He set him up in business in a royal fashion.

7. Man's first employment was divinely selected. Adam could not feel that possibly he had made a mistake in his calling. It is a grand thing to feel that we are working where God placed us. A man who can feel this will be strong in his work. To realize that we are doing what God would have us do gives contentment, confidence and strength.

This divinely selected employment teaches some very important lessons: First of all, the lesson of industry. The earth is not much impressed by our indolent pomposity. She does not care for strutting vanity. She responds to nothing but humble toil. She says to man, If you want my rich products, you must pay the price of patient labor; sow in the autumn, reap in the summer. We may get impatient, nature will not. "Learn to labor and to wait," says mother earth.

Another lesson is that of honest equivalent. Until this is learned there is no solid success. Get much for little is the passion with many. Small investments, large returns. The earth says, no labor, no reward. Much labor, large returns. Here is the law of solid progress. Then, too, it teaches the

lesson of like for like. Men can not sow tares and reap wheat. "Be not deceived: God is not mocked; whatsoever a man sows, that shall he also reap."

This is the best school in which to learn the lesson of self-control. Fitful anger makes little impression on the ground. By storming and raging we may frighten a man or a beast, but the earth will never tremble. We may coerce man by violence into doing our will, but we can not coerce the ground. A passionate, fuming, fretful man is never a pleasant sight. It is a great school that teaches man the lesson of self-control. Industry, patience, self-control, an honest equivalent. He who has learned these great lessons is far on the road to success.

Still further, the field teaches that pruning and cultivation are necessary to success. Fruit trees must be pruned in order to yield fruit. Weeds must be uprooted or the crop will perish. This suggests a great lesson in regard to life. The pruning and weeding-out processes are necessary in order to secure a noble, fruitful life. Vicious habits must be cut off. Idleness, lust, laziness, carelessness, slovenliness, cruelty—these things must be weeded out. Truly nature is a comprehensive teacher. Is this one reason why so many of our great men come from the farm?

In the field we also learn the important lesson of receive and give. This is the true law of growth. The plant takes that it may give. It is a greedy, hungry thing, but it is also a most generous thing. It freely gives back all it receives. Appropriation and distribution are the two indispensable conditions of growth. To omit either is to arrest the process. Happy is he who learns this lesson early in life.

Last of all, in the garden, in the field, is taught the lesson of faith. If we have not faith, we will not sow. If we have not faith that God will do his part, we will not plant. Whether the man realizes it or not, faith is the motive power behind all his activity. The field is a poor place in which to learn the lesson of infidelity.

The foregoing lessons well learned will go far to secure highest success. All true progress proceeds on these principles. All great lawyers, doctors, preachers, etc., are men of slow growth. "Hasten slowly" is a very wise maxim. Give the mind time to expand. Remember, you can not reap till you have sown and given the plant time to grow and come to maturity. "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Then, too, man must be severe with himself. He must prune and weed. No matter how dear the evil thing may be, he must cut it off. "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out," was the teaching of our Master, and this falls into beautiful harmony with the teaching of nature. Truly God conferred on Adam a great blessing when he put him in the garden to dress it and to keep it.

CHAPTER XIII.

Beginnings as Revealed in Genesis—The Beginning of Probation.

1. The principle of probation is necessary and far-reaching. Probation means the "act of proving." It is a test or demonstration. Its purpose is to reveal the weak points and demonstrate the strength of that which is tested. In the domain of mind it may serve to strengthen the intellectual and moral powers. A trial successfully encountered strengthens the individual tried. Every victory is attended with the acquisition of power. Temptation, if resisted, may therefore become a means of grace. Does not this throw light on the words of the apostle, "Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold temptations, knowing that the proof of your faith worketh patience." "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation, for when he hath been approved, he shall receive the crown of life." However, let it be well understood that beneficent ends are reached only when temptation is successfully resisted. If the individual falls, he is weakened by the experience and less able to successfully cope with succeeding temptations. But at least we may take comfort from the fact that God, in permitting us to be tempted, is giving us a chance to become men of ever-increasing measures of strength and power.

2. It should be kept in mind that this testing process is for man's sake. Man needs to be revealed to himself

rather than to be revealed to God. The Creator knows the creature, but man does not know himself till he is tried. Oftentimes he makes startling and alarming discoveries that otherwise would have escaped observation until perhaps it were too late to be benefited by the discovery. Be it also observed that the individual's strength, or lack of strength, is only shown when resistance is put forth, and herein lies a great good. The individual discovers where his weak point is, and thus he is not only put on his guard, but is enabled to strengthen the weak place in his armor.

In this chapter we will study the testing process as it was experienced by the first man and woman, an account of which we find in Genesis, second and third chapters. Let us notice:

I. The leading features of this account.

1. The conditions were eminently favorable to man. God planted a beautiful garden and placed man in it to dress and keep it. In this garden were fruits necessary to satisfy man's wants, of which he might freely eat with the exception of the fruit of one tree. This was the only restriction placed upon man. His surroundings were favorable in the extreme. He was not the victim of depraved tastes or bad habits, nor could the blame in case of failure be charged to hereditary taint. Furthermore, his instructions were perfectly clear. Nothing could be charged to ignorance. He knew just what was required and what the result of disobedience would be. Adam's test was therefore the test of human nature under most favorable conditions. His fall can not be charged to an individual weakness, that a stronger man under more favorable circumstances might have avoided.

In this connection I pause to remark: that whatever excuse for sin heredity may offer in certain extreme and rare cases, in most instances the plea is that of cowardice. It is unmanly for a man to try to throw the blame of his moral delinquencies upon his ancestors. If the truth could be known, it would doubtless appear that heredity has a larger sum to be placed to its credit than can justly be charged against it. The legacy of good that comes to most of us through heredity is greater than the legacy of evil. Let no one, then, drift along complacently under the delusion that his sins will be charged up to his ancestors. In the judgment he may wake to find that in his account with his ancestors the balance stands in their favor.

2. Man's overthrow was accomplished through the seductive influence of an adversary called the serpent. This adversary worked through Adam's companion, who, it is fair to presume, was the more easily influenced of the two. This tempter flatly contradicted Adam's Maker. His words were believed by the woman and his counsel accepted and acted upon. Adam in turn yielded to the temptation. God's will was thus set aside in favor of Satan's will. Salvation is, after all, a question of the supremacy of God's will. When man makes God's will his law of life he is saved. Man lost his innocence by the act of disobedience. In the exercise of his godlike freedom, he chose to go contrary to the divine will, thus introducing discord into the moral world.

This leads us to consider:

II. The nature of the test.

1. It was simple. This is a most necessary quality. It must be easily understood. Infidelity says: "It is unreasonable to suppose that God would have hinged

man's destiny on anything so simple." It is in this fact that the wonderful wisdom becomes most apparent. A difficult, incomprehensible test would have placed man at a great disadvantage; in fact, would have been no test at all. The simplicity of the test does not, however, destroy its strength, but, on the contrary, increases it. It appealed to man's appetite, which is the weakest point, in the most direct and simple way.

2. It was purely a test of faith. It was a positive precept. The reason for obedience rested solely in the authority of the lawgiver. No reason for obedience could have been apparent except the fact that God had required it. It is not too much to say that man's loyalty to God could not have been tested by a moral precept. The reason for this must be apparent to any one on a moment's reflection. Nor would a test involving a moral principle have been so strong a test of faith. Moral principles have their basis in the nature of things. A moral act is right or wrong in itself. A positive act is right simply because commanded. Hence, a positive act enjoined by the lawgiver is the strongest possible test of loyalty and of faith.

We should guard against the idea that this test was the cause of man's sin. It rather revealed him to himself. It showed him the weakness of his confidence in God. Under the Christian dispensation baptism furnishes just such a test. Some object to it because no moral quality is discoverable in it. It is this fact that makes it purely an act of faith. It is therefore a test of loyalty. That it has a spiritual significance is true, but the act in itself has no discoverable moral quality. The reason for its performance rests solely on the authority of the Lawgiver, hence he prefaces his command with the declaration of his authority: "All authority has been

given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit." It is not, therefore, an act that may be changed or set aside on the ground that it has no moral quality, but it is a test of loyalty and faith, being the first overt act required of the penitent believer.

We are next led to consider:

III. The nature of the penalty.

But two positions, so far as I can see, are possible: First, that the penalty was physical death, or, second, that it was moral or spiritual death.

1. It was not physical death, as appears from the following reasons. Death was in the world before man sinned. Adam's physical life was sustained by death; consequently, physical death existed prior to Adam's sin. The design that is shown in natural things reveals the idea of death. Some animals are created so as to be able to prey on other animals. The ox grazing in the meadow, the lion feeding on his prey, the weaker animal feeding on the stronger, all teach the lesson that life is sustained by death. Furthermore, the language used is very specific. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." As this points to an immediate death, and Adam did not die physically for hundreds of years, physical death could scarcely have been the penalty. Other strong reasons might be given.

2. It must therefore have been a moral death. Herbert Spencer's definition of life fits this account most admirably. He says: "Life is correspondence to environment." The Bible teaches that God is the true environment of the soul. "In him we live and move and have our being." We hear much said about the imma-

nence of God, which, properly understood, is doubtless a true doctrine—that is, when it does not take on a pantheistic form—but the immanence of man in God seems to be the divine conception. To dwell in God, and hence to enjoy man's divinely ordained environment, is to live in him by faith, confidence and obedience. It is to make the divine will and purpose our will and purpose. Hence, when the human will or Satan's will is exalted above the divine will, man's true environment is lost. There is no longer correspondence to environment as Henry Drummond argues, and death is consequently the result. Disobedience separates man from God, or, as the Scripture puts it: "Our sins separate between us and God." Therefore by disobedience the soul loses its true environment, and hence is dead, or, in other words, disobedience causes moral death. All this harmonizes with Christ's definition of life. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John also teaches the same doctrine: "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." The penalty is, therefore, a natural result rather than an arbitrary punishment.

IV. The lesson of the test.

1. We learn that God, in creating man, did not create a mere machine. Inferentially we gathered this from the statement that God created man in his own image. Here, however, the truth comes out clear and strong. Man has power to choose. He is not a being acting under a compulsory and immutable decree. In this respect he is like his great Creator. God is a free agent, and he has endowed his creature man with this divine attribute. Man can act from within and not

simply because acted upon from without. Here is the basis of human responsibility.

In order for man to exercise choice and give expression to his own will, there must be certain lines of conduct to choose between. God therefore gave him choice between obedience and disobedience. Gen. 2:16, 17: "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it." Here are two simple lines of conduct pointed out to man; one is right and the other is wrong. He is permitted to take his choice. He is not compelled to do the right, but he is held responsible. God does not propose to secure right acting by a mere exercise of omnipotent power. This would be to rob man of his chief glory. God permits the possibility of wrong for the sake of securing right through independent, free action. How great is the being we call man!

2. We learn that it is necessary to subject everything intended for high and noble use to this testing process. This importance is acknowledged and acted upon in all the practical affairs of life. The man who purchases a horse desires to test him that he may know his value. The vessel is tested to ascertain its strength. The steam boiler is tested before it is placed where it can endanger life. So God tested the most wonderful piece of mechanism he had ever made. This was not simply an individual test, but the test of human nature. Adam's sin revealed the weakness of man, and not simply of a man. Adam's fall was the fall of all. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

3. We learn that the testing process is individual as well as general. Adam fell in an individual as well as in a representative capacity, and his experience shows that every man will fail as he failed. Unaided human

nature can not endure this test. Our own consciousness tells us we have failed. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us" (1 John 1:8). But let us remember that it is not God's purpose to leave man to struggle against the forces of sin without divine help. This is realized in the second Adam, not in the first. The divine plan contemplates the marrying of the human to the divine. Man is to be made partaker of the divine nature. This is the grand consummation had in view, and not until this point is reached is creation complete, and to this goal the divine plan majestically advances nor does it stop short of its attainment. This, then, is the divine plan for overcoming sin—to unite the human and the divine. This is accomplished by the Divine Spirit taking up its abode in man. This gift of the Spirit is the crowning blessing of the Christian dispensation. This is the great consummation that God had in view from the beginning. If at any time we come short, or fall before the onslaughts of Satan, let us not give up in despair, but rather let us be comforted by the words of the great apostle: "Not that I have already attained or am already made perfect; but I press on if so be that I may apprehend that for which also I was apprehended by Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself yet to have apprehended, but one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Be it observed that Adam was safe so long as he held on to God by faith. We must lay hold of God by faith in order to stand the test. Jesus came to give us such a vision of God as will enable us to trust him. Hence he says: "Without me ye can do nothing." "He that hath seen me hath seen

the Father." The man who lays hold of God by faith as he is revealed in Jesus Christ, and whose faith eventuates in obedience to the positive test imposed, thus demonstrating the genuineness of his faith, receives the gift of the Holy Spirit, and thus endowed he goes forth to the conflict in the sure confidence of ultimate victory.

4. We learn that this test, like everything else God does in his dealings with man, had reference to man's good. We should not regard this language as a challenge or threat. It is rather a revelation. Its purpose was to reveal to man his danger. Man's danger is never so great as when he is ignorant of any danger. To know one's danger is the strongest fortification against it, short of divine help. Nor was this a plan to involve man in difficulty. It is rather a mark of benevolence. It is a kindness to reveal man to himself. "Know thyself" is a most necessary and wholesome injunction.

5. In this test is shown the very narrow line between safety and ruin. This is true as regards life and death of every kind. One act and we die physically. One act and we die morally. One act and we die socially. One wrong line of action and we die intellectually. The body may be slain by a single act. Virtue, honesty, truthfulness, may be lost by a single act. Social standing may be thrown away by one misdemeanor. Intellectual vigor may be destroyed by one bad habit. The two spheres touch. There is no borderland between.

6. This test reveals the fact that there is a boundary line to the gratification of the senses beyond which one may not pass except at his own awful peril. Only one tree was prohibited. Thus far shalt thou go, but no farther. There is, and there must be, a limit to the gratification of appetite. One of the greatest perils to the soul lies in an undue influence of the senses. The

senses are intended to be man's faithful servants, but woe be to that man when they become his master. Paul said: "Fleshly lusts war against the soul." "I keep my body under." The man that reels along the street with almost idiotic expression of countenance, or perchance wallows in the gutter, or that other with brutish, lustful features, failed to learn this lesson. The senses have become masters. Such have failed to learn that there is a tree the fruit of which they may not eat.

7. In this test we learn that the citadel of man's moral nature is captured easiest if attacked along the line of the senses. Satan never makes a mistake in a matter like this. He always attacks the weakest place. He never comes to a man at his strong point. This fact reveals to us the danger of much that is being carried on around us. The open saloon is Satan's battering-ram to beat down the fortifications of the soul. It is an attack through the senses. Sensual plays, songs and pictures serve Satan's purpose in the same way. Sensual literature is a most effective weapon for the destruction of the soul. Paul saw the danger and said: "Lust when it is finished bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." This should teach us to avoid all institutions that administer to the gratification of the senses merely. The pleasure of the senses should never be sought as an end, but the senses should be used as means by which high and noble ends are reached. This principle condemns many of the practices of men. Dancing, much of the theater-going, the drinking of spiritous liquors, are examples in point. To use the senses as servants means to mount heavenward. To use them as mere instruments of pleasure means to travel the downward road that leads to death.

8. This test shows that the triumph of sense means the ruin of man's highest interests. The eating of the

forbidden fruit meant the loss of man's highest privileges —loss of God's fellowship, loss of a beautiful place of abode admirably adapted to man's every want, the loss of peace, self-respect and happiness. This truth is illustrated in numerous instances:

When Eve saw that the fruit was pleasant to the eye and good for food, she yielded to the temptation. When Esau's appetite craved Jacob's savory dish, he bartered his birthright for it. When the Israelites in the wilderness remembered the leeks and onions of Egypt, they murmured against God and Moses, and lost the promised land by their rebellion. When David saw the beauty of Uriah's wife, he devised murder in his heart in order to secure her. We see men every day bartering highest privileges for the pleasures of sense that endure but a moment. The body, the intellect, the conscience, the soul, eternity itself, are sacrificed for sense. Paul says, "To be carnally minded is death."

9. As we study this test, certain great truths stand out in bold relief. We may learn that:

(1) There is much of good that may be enjoyed. Man's earthly abode is furnished with many blessings. There are many trees of blessing: The intellectual tree, the social tree, the religious tree all bear good fruit, and even the tree of sense bears wholesome food. The sin lies in the abuse and not in the proper use.

(2) God's blessings must be enjoyed under divine restrictions. To disregard these restrictions is to perish.

(3) There is a fellowship of evil; wrong-doing likes company. Herein is seen the power of example.

(4) The insufficiency of unaided human nature should never be lost sight of. Victory is possible through the second Adam, not through the first.

(5) It is possible to rise out of defeat and to turn it to highest account.

CHAPTER XIV.

Beginning as Revealed in Genesis—The Beginning of Sin and Its Attendant Evils.

1. A serious view of sin is a matter of great importance. There is nothing more disastrous, nothing more to be deplored, than the disposition to take light, inadequate views of sin. Unfortunately, this disposition prevails to an alarming extent. There is a tendency to regard sin as rather a misfortune than as a fault. It is excused, palliated and condoned. It is clothed in such attractive dress or cloaked in such euphemistic phrases that its hideous character is lost sight of. It is perhaps impossible for us to fully comprehend the awful, deadly nature of sin. The Bible always magnifies its terrible character. It employs the strongest language in describing it. It uses leprosy, the most loathsome disease known to man, as its symbol. It connects it with the most awful penalties, both here and hereafter.

2. The meaning of sin should be profoundly impressed on every mind. The Bible defines it as a transgression of law. This may seem to be a small matter, but a moment's reflection will show it to be of most serious moment. Law is an expression of God's will which is the fountain of all harmony and blessedness. Order prevails only where God's will is supreme. It reigns in the physical world because there God's will is supreme. It reigns in heaven for the same reason. There is discord on earth because God's will is not done and because man

in the exercise of his own will has moved in opposition to the divine will. Sin violates the moral order of the universe and therefore has consequences of the most far-reaching character. It breaks the connection between man and God, and hence introduces death.

3. Etymologically, the word is most suggestive. *Hamartia* (translated "sin") means to miss the mark. It means that the individual is turned from the true course of life; that he is not moving in the divinely appointed orbit. Having departed from the right path, he can never reach his high destiny unless he is brought back to the divinely appointed way. God's will must be made supreme, and consequently man's will must be subordinated to the will divine. Unless this be done man will miss the mark. He will not achieve the high ends of being. Consequently, it is said God can not look upon sin with the least degree of allowance. To do so would be to encourage rebellion and bring about the overthrow of his moral government.

I. The Book of Genesis gives us a history of the beginning of sin.

1. Man's primitive condition of holiness is the true background upon which to project the dark picture of sin. The first picture which the divine artist paints of man is one of exceeding beauty. He had a holy nature, a place exactly suited to his wants, congenial companionship, intimate personal communion with God, suitable employment. As a natural result of this holiness, man was happy. Holiness and happiness stand in the relation of cause and effect; man can not have the latter without the former. Happiness is the stream of which holiness is the fountain. Happiness is the fruit of which holiness is the tree. External circumstances can never bring to

man real and true happiness. "Being" is the fountain of happiness and not "having."

2. Man's actual condition is one of sinfulness or depravity. It is unnecessary to take up time to prove the existence of sin. Is it right for a man to degrade himself to the brute level? Is it right for an ingrate son to break the heart of father and mother? Is it right for an abandoned husband and father to disgrace children and break the heart of his innocent wife? Is it right for the demon in human shape to blight the life of the innocent, trusting maiden? Is there no difference in the moral quality of actions? To ask these questions is to answer them. Every man's own consciousness declares him to be a sinner. Few people can be found who will claim to be sinless, and the few strangely deluded souls who do make this claim disprove their own claim by their words and actions. The best are conscious not only of shortcomings, but of more or less actual transgression. The Bible statement, "There is none righteous, no, not one," is fully corroborated by conscious human experience.

3. The Bible account of the origin of sin is entirely reasonable and adequate. The Bible in large measure assumes the fact of sin and that man recognizes its existence. It declares it as a fact, but it does not stop to prove it. It never argues the case. It assumes that which consciousness recognizes. It does, however, offer an explanation of the recognized existing fact. It states how it originated. Man was put into Eden with freedom of choice. Two lines of conduct were placed before him and open to him. A malignant agent came and tempted the woman. She yielded to the temptation and afterward the man also fell. This account is entirely reasonable. Some ridicule it and call it silly; still, no one can deny

that the world is sick. We do not trust, love and sympathize. We do hate and injure one another. What made the world sick? The Bible says it was the fruit of disobedience, and all must admit that this is a reasonable explanation. The account is also entirely adequate. The fruit of disobedience will make a man sick physically; all physical disease grows out of disobedience. The same is true socially; social evils result from the violation of moral law. The same is true legally: those men behind the bars ate the fruit of disobedience. The law holds good spiritually; spiritual disease and death follow disobedience to divine law.

4. Disobedience is not spontaneous to the human soul. Man's spiritual overthrow was accomplished by an external agent. The suggestion to sin did not come from within. This fact alone is sufficient to kindle hope.

Who was this external agent? On this point the Scriptures are explicit. Rev. 12:7,9: "And there was war in heaven: and Michael and his angels fought against the dragon. . . . And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." (*b*) John 8:44: "Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth." Matt. 25:41: "Then shall he say to them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." 2 Pet. 2:4: "For God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment."

The existence of Satan is a logical necessity, the existence of sin being admitted. There must necessarily

be grades of sin or wrong. He who descends to the lowest depth is Satan. It also seems to be true that the higher the nature, the lower the fall of which it is capable. Satan before he fell doubtless stood near the throne.

A reason for the difference in God's treatment of sinning men and sinning angels may here be seen. Angels sinned from within. Such seems to be the necessary conclusion. Man sinned through the temptation of an adversary.

5. The character of the temptation Satan employed is very clear.

It appealed to man's natural desire to rise. It was a good that Satan offered. "Ye shall be as gods." This desire to rise is right. I pity those who do not aspire. Satan took advantage of this. So he always comes. The entrance to the paths of sin is made beautiful.

It utilizes the tendency in men to regard themselves as exceptions to general rules. Eat, said Satan; you will not die. You will be an exception. So it is now. Will this cup kill? Yes, but I will be an exception. Disregard this condition of success; you will escape the consequences. Men indulge in wine, cards, gambling, all forms of dissipation, on this principle.

It introduced into man's heart distrust of God. God is unreasonable. "Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden?" Spoken, maybe, with covert sneer. It hinted also at the possibility of God being jealous or unreasonable, or lacking in desire for man's highest good.

It appealed to the tendency to weigh the divine commands in the scales of human judgment. It looks good, therefore it is good. How modern is this account; in fact, it happens every day.

It probably made use of the power of example. "When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, . . . she took of the fruit thereof." Satan may have eaten. How else could Eve have seen that the tree was good for food? A mighty power this for evil. There is nothing so persuasive as example.

It was a very cunning and subtle temptation. Woman is more confiding and less suspicious than man. She was alone and unsupported. The devil never comes to a man at his strongest moment.

It was accomplished through the agency of a third party. What was this serpent? A subtle animal—an instrument Satan could use. It had the gift of speech, whatever it may have been. The practical point is that Satan used an instrument. He does so yet. Authors, lecturers, young men, maidens, music, art, may all be made the tools of Satan.

6. A few results of yielding to Satan are shown:

"Their eyes were opened." Temptation closes men's eyes, but sin and guilt are great eye-openers; we see ourselves as we are; we loathe our ugliness, at least in the first stages.

They were ashamed. They made aprons of fig leaves. This is a modern practice; we try to cover our deformity with garments of our own making. One man makes him an apron of money or property, another of education, another of social standing. No garment of man's making can ever cover the deformity of sin.

II. We have in the Book of Genesis a history of the beginning of fear. (Gen. 3: 8-13.) They hid themselves because they were afraid.

1. God's first question to man is very suggestive: "Where art thou?" Why should God ask such a ques-

tion? He needs no instruction. Is infinite wisdom seeking instruction of a finite man? There is no more impressive way of giving instruction than by putting it in interrogative form. The attempt to answer the question reveals in a striking way the truth that needs to be impressed. Hence it is that God's revelation abounds in questions of God addressed to man: "Why do you spend your money for that which is not bread?" "What shall it profit a man if he should gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" "Why stand here all the day idle?" "Turn ye, turn ye, for why will you die?"

2. The purpose of God's question clear. It looks manward. It is not for God's information. He requires us to pray, yet he knows our wants. The secret is not hard to discover. It is asked for man's sake. Why does the teacher ask questions? In trying to answer, the pupil discovers his weak point. So God deals with us. He reveals us to ourselves in the most impressive way.

3. God's question teaches some important truths by implication. We may surely learn that man was not in his true position—the position where God placed him. At first he was in a calm, expectant attitude, awaiting God. Not so now. He no longer awaits God's coming with composure. "Where art thou?" He was no longer in the right place, but he was in a false position, a position where he ought not to be. He was hiding away in fear; shrinking away in dread. This is a sad spectacle: creature afraid of creator, man afraid of God, child afraid of his father.

There was nothing in God to cause fear in man. God is pure, but children do not fear purity. It is true, however, that the impure hate purity. God is holy, but children do not fear holiness. Children struggled to get into Christ's arms. When children fear you, fear yourself.

God is wise, but children do not fear wisdom. What child ever feared his father more, for being wise? Does he not think father knows more than all others? God is powerful, but children do not fear power. In answering God's question, Adam could not place the blame for his fear upon God.

There was nothing in man's surroundings to cause man to be afraid of God. There was a rich banquet for his physical nature; a world of symbolized thought for his intellectual nature. How much there is to kindle thought, awake reflection, call imagination into activity. For his emotional nature, Eden's beauties were prepared. For his social nature, there was a perfect companionship. Sometimes two are unhappily mated, but not so here. God made this match. For his spiritual nature there was close fellowship with God. The closer we get to God the more we grow spiritually. Man loves power. Here is a world to govern to gratify this propensity. All things were put under him. Was not everything calculated to awaken confidence? One would expect to see man running to God and falling into his arms like the little child when father comes at evening. Instead, he hides away with wildly beating heart, with pale cheek blanched with dread and fear. Something terrible has happened.

4. God's question reveals much as to himself. It shows that his interest in man is still alive. "Where art thou?" God might have hurled man down as he did fallen angels. He might have turned his back in indifference and left him to his awful fate, but we see that God will still seek man, although he hide away in guilty fear. All God's dealing is a continual search after the hiding culprit. Jesus said: "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." "What man of you having a hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave

the ninety and nine in the wilderness and go after that which is lost until he find it?" The gospel of God's grace is all wrapped up in the question, "Where art thou?"

5. We may also get a hint from this question concerning duty. It is the duty of man to take his bearings, to see where he is. Many never ask the question, "Where am I?" till it is too late. It is the duty of man to think. Oh that my people would consider! No man who hides from God will stay hid very long, if he thinks. There is no more healthy exercise than that of thinking; nor is there anything that people are less disinclined to do. Men escape the necessity, if possible.

6. Some results of this fear of God are very manifest. Fear is the parent of much of false religion, and even much atheism. The slavish fear of God leads to deeds of self-torture and all the hideous practices of ignorance and superstition, and, on the other hand, the fear of God leads some to try to persuade themselves that there is no God.

Fear causes men to fight God. We fight what we fear. It is also love that brings man into willing subjection to the infinite Father. Fear deprives man of his truest happiness. Fear is slavery, it is torture; it takes the joy and sweetness out of life and fills it with dread.

III. In the Book of Genesis we also find the beginning of envy.

1. The dire effects of disobedience soon manifested themselves in the history of our race. Let no one entertain the fatal delusion that the bitter harvest of sin is either uncertain or far away. Those who are disposed to take light views of sin ought to see their mistake

by considering the developments that took place soon after its introduction into the world. The innocence, the joy, the blessedness of Eden withered under its blighting touch. It was impossible for man to lose his holiness and retain his happiness. When will mankind learn this important truth!

2. The dark picture is revealed in its hideous outlines in the history of Cain.

Here we discover that man, made in the image of God—made to love—had lost this divine characteristic and had become like the master he had chosen—that wicked one through whose agency sin had entered the world. The subjective effects of sin upon the hearts and lives of the first pair are not revealed to us, the outward consequences alone are disclosed. But in the case of Cain, the inward effects are clearly manifest. No more unlovely sight can be imagined than the view the divine artist paints of this sin-cursed life.

It is important also to keep in mind the fact that the results of sin seen in the life of Cain are possible in the life of every man. That they are not realized in each individual is due to the goodness of God manifested in the remedial agencies which he has graciously inaugurated and through which the awful effects of sin are thwarted in many cases and potentially in all.

3. The history given us of Cain brings to view the diabolical principle of envy as an active force in the human soul. This satanic feeling is one of the firstfruits of a sinful heart. It is specially characteristic of its author, the devil. Satan introduced into God's universe sin by opposing his will to the will divine and the effects were speedily manifest. Envy was the natural and necessary fruit, and this deadly principle caused him to lift up the hand of rebellion against Jehovah. Being

cast out of heaven on this account, he became the prince of darkness, and we are told that he goes up and down in the earth seeking whom he may devour. This deadly principle took possession of Cain, as in fact it does of every man who yields himself up to become the servant of Satan. His heart—and this is the fountain of life in every man—having been polluted by sin, to which he had doubtless given hospitable entertainment, had become the abode of envy, an inevitable result in all such cases. Fraternal love was driven from his heart by the envy he felt because his brother's offering had been accepted by God while his own had been rejected. The reason for this discrimination doubtless lay in the fact that Abel offered his sacrifice according to God's will, while Cain in making his offering had substituted his own will for the will divine. But this mattered not with sinful Cain. Envy entered his heart and was allowed to dwell there, and whenever this is the case the most serious consequences must inevitably follow. Now the conditions exist adequate to produce deeds of darkness of the blackest hue.

This account shows to us the unnatural and inhuman character of envy. Abel was a lovable brother. He was guilty of no provocation. He even desired his brother's acceptance with God. He did not parade his own righteousness or exult in the fact that he enjoyed the divine favor. Envy, however, is blind to every lovable trait. It hears no word of approval for the object against which it is directed. Cain disregarded even the natural ties of brotherhood. Abel was his own mother's son. He had shared with him the love of the same parents and enjoyed the blessing of the same home. A true man will love even an unworthy brother. Envy closes the eyes to the noblest qualities and steels the heart against the holiest ties. It is indeed a hideous monster, an

emanation from the bottomless pit, a child of the devil, manifesting his diabolical character to the fullest extent.

IV. The history also makes clear the fact that hatred comes next in order as a natural and inevitable consequence of envy.

1. This hatred did not result from wrong that had been suffered. Hatred does not always result from wrongs received. I believe I may go so far as to say it does not generally result in that way. We are more apt to hate those we wrong than those that wrong us. It is generally very hard to forgive a man for the wrong we do him.

2. In this case the hate was clearly the outgrowth of envy. It is always but a short step from envy to hatred. He who gives hospitable entertainment to the demon of envy will soon have a brood of devils encamped within him. The dislike and hatred everywhere seen are for the most part the children of envy. It is hard for some men to look complacently on the success of others. Envy enters their hearts and hatred soon follows. It is hard for some men to treat a rival with noble magnanimity, especially when the rival seems to be meeting with the larger measure of success. Envy followed by hatred too often is the result. This feeling of hatred in Cain shows that the downward path of the soul in sin is very swift.

V. The next logical step in this awful development was that of violence.

"Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him" (Gen. 4:8).

1. This account shows the blindness of violence. Cain's nature demanded that which Abel could give. He needed sympathy; Abel could give it. He needed

help; Abel could be a competent helper. The violent man generally inflicts the deepest wounds upon himself. The murderer suffers more than his victim, and if he is past suffering it only shows his condition to be still more deplorable.

2. This account shows one fruitful cause of violence. The first murder was instigated by hatred and not by revenge. Jesus said, "He that hateth his brother is a murderer." When revenge is the immediate cause, hatred is generally a more remote cause. A man is never so much the child of Satan as when he lifts up his hand in violence (except in self-defense or on behalf of the weak), because back of it lie the evil passions of envy and hatred.

3. Furthermore, this account shows what right may always expect from wrong. The first murder was the slaying of the innocent by the guilty. The first murderer was a wicked man, while the first martyr was a saint. This should teach us that there never can be any compromise between good and bad. Evil will never recognize the right of the good to exist. Righteousness is always an offense to wickedness. Every great cause of truth and right has been founded in the blood of martyrs. Every attempt that right makes to compromise with wrong is at the expense of right. This explains why the license system of dealing with the liquor problem is always and everywhere a failure. It is an attempt to compromise with wrong.

4. We may learn from this account that a righteous death is more to be desired than an unrighteous life. Abel's death had in it a crown of glory. Being dead, he yet speaks as the advocate of truth and integrity. Cain said: "My punishment is more than I can bear." So it must ever be. Whose place in history is more to be desired—Cain's or Abel's? Herod's or John's? Nero's

or Paul's? This fact should be sufficient to regulate every act of life. A right act, though it fail, is better than a wrong act, though it succeed.

5. The fact is here disclosed that death is not the worst evil nor life the highest boon. Abel was righteous. His death could not have been inflicted as a punishment. Had death been a necessary evil and life a necessary boon, would not Cain have died and Abel have continued to live? May we not read in this death a promise of a better life beyond? If Abel's life ended here, is not wrong better than right, evil better than good? A future life is demanded to right the wrongs of this world.

6. The innate sympathy of man with that which is good is shown by the place assigned to Abel in the common heart of mankind. Let it not be supposed that mankind naturally, spontaneously and willingly approves the wrong and condemns the right. The exact reverse is true. The people love the right and hate the wrong; they love justice and hate injustice; they love mercy and hate cruelty; they love liberty and hate oppression. Men may choose the wrong through ignorance or prejudice. Individuals may choose the wrong through self-interest or other base motives, but the people enlightened and freed from prejudice, when they see and understand the right, will approve it in preference to the wrong. This is one hopeful indication. So said Wendell Phillips, and universal history asserts the truth. Righteous Abel has ever held a place of honor, respect and love in the hearts of mankind, while Cain has ever been regarded with aversion and horror. This is one explanation of the truth so well expressed by the poet:

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
While error wounded writhes in pain,
And dies amidst its worshipers."

CHAPTER XV.

Beginnings as Revealed in Genesis—The Beginning of Altruism and of Human Redemption. *

1. The doctrine of egoism is destructive to the best interests of humanity. No man lives unto himself. To attempt it is to undertake the impossible. It is to set at naught the demands of the physical and intellectual constitution of man. It is to strike at the social order as designed by the Creator. To live for self is to defeat the very purpose the individual has in view. It is a divine law unerring and sure that "he that saves his life shall lose it." He that makes self an end puts himself in conflict with God, with society and with his own being. Selfishness leads to ruin. It is the very root of sin. It is the exact opposite of love, which is the essence of God. On the other hand:

2. The doctrine of altruism makes for the highest good of the individual and of the race. It operates in harmony with the constitution of man individually and of the race collectively. "He that loses his life shall save it" is a doctrine embodying the profoundest philosophy. It is founded on the most radical insight into the nature of man. "To give is to save" expresses a radical truth, paradoxical as it may appear. He who adopts this principle as the true philosophy of life shows himself to be a consistent child of the heavenly Father, who is the bountiful giver of every good and perfect gift and who

* I am indebted to Dr. Talmage for some thoughts in some of these chapters on "Beginnings."

teaches us by example and word that "it is more blessed to give than to receive." The true object of appropriation is distribution, which in turn leads to fuller appropriation. True growth is never realized except under the operation of the law of distribution. To withhold is to dwarf the organism and finally to destroy it. It is to ignore a basal principle of the universe. We would naturally expect a principle so radical, far-reaching and important to appear in this great book of beginnings, and we are not disappointed.

I. We have in the Book of Genesis a history of the beginning of altruism.

1. Here the fact first comes to light that God makes one man responsible for the well-being of another, which logically leads to the conclusion that the highest good of the individual lies in serving his fellows. Surely we may conclude that a benevolent Creator would lay no obligation on the creature except for the creature's good.

The doctrine of man's responsibility for his fellow-man comes out in the question to Cain, "Where is Abel thy brother?" It is a doctrine of deep and far-reaching significance. This question implies that man ought to know where his brother is. Our duties do not relate to self alone. The interest and welfare of others should hold a place in our thought. We also learn that injuries done to man are noticed in heaven. A man may do his work in the dark, slay his victim, rob the widow, slander his neighbor, wound his feelings, but God takes an interest in every man and notices the wrong. Let no man conclude that he can injure his fellow-man with impunity; impartial investigation will be made. Men may hide their meanness from one another, but not from God. God will espouse the cause of the injured. To wrong

man is to raise one's hand against God. Every unjust act is an attack on God. So of every unkind word. What the wrong-doer needs is eyes to see God standing behind the victim of his wrong.

2. Here is also disclosed man's reluctance to acknowledge this responsibility. "Am I my brother's keeper?" Words how often repeated! This is very strange. We want to be absolved from all duty to others, but we would not like to release others from all duty to us. We are very dependent on others for all that we need. Clothes, food, society, are all essential, and for these we must depend on others very largely. Before we deny our obligation to others let us ask, Can we absolve others from obligation to us?

3. Let us consider the extent of this obligation. How far does the duty of the individual extend? Some one may say, "Abel was Cain's brother in the flesh." It is wonderful how small the soul can get. We are disposed to confine our love and sympathy to very narrow circles. Let others starve if those of my circle are fed. Let others go ignorant if my children are educated. Even Christians are sometimes very unchristian. We give to our own town, neighborhood, but we have no sense of obligation toward the vast wide world. We do not rejoice in the salvation of any except the great or those of our own circle. We are all brethren. The man in the gutter, the man with black skin, the man in China, is our brother. We are all blood relatives. "God has made of one blood all nations to dwell on the face of the earth."

In the second place, we may well consider the extent of the demands it makes on the individual. How much shall I give? Do I owe every man my all? God has given us nothing for self. To withhold means to lose. To give all means to save all. The wise man said:

"There is that which withholdeth and yet tendeth to poverty. There is that which scattereth abroad and yet increaseth."

4. What shall we say of the baseness of the individual who does not recognize this obligation? This is selfishness which is of the devil. It is foolish because it disregards the means employed by others to become great. It assumes that the individual self need pay no attention to the rules that obtain with the generality of men. The ego is so important, so supreme, that he bears no relation to mankind at large. He is a law unto himself. Selfishness is egotism of the worst type. It destroys the sacredness of the strongest ties, and places the individual out of harmony with God's great world. It looks upon the virtues of others with an evil and hostile eye. It scruples not to injure the innocent. Suffering and need appeal to it in vain. Under its blighting influence the most beautiful flowers of the human soul wither and die.

5. The evil consequences growing out of the refusal to discharge this obligation, are manifest. Such a man virtually undertakes to live independent, which is impossible. Have you thought who the independent man is? The savage comes nearest. He can more nearly absolve all others from any obligation to him than any other man. This idea of independence involves, then, the reducing of man to the savage or even the brute state. A brute can be more independent than a man. Such a man ignores the law of individual growth. He makes his own progress impossible by disregarding the necessary conditions of progress. Nay, more, he insures his own decadence and final destruction.

The suffering that the failure to recognize this obligation entails is not the least of the evils involved.

A man must meet: Condemnation by self—he loathes himself. This is suffering that is most extreme. He is condemned by men. Unselfishness always wins respect and love, while selfishness is always hated and despised. This also involves great suffering. He is condemned by God. God is love and love is unselfish. God only approves the unselfish man. Greatness in God's kingdom is determined by unselfishness. "He that would be greatest among you, let him be servant of all." God's condemnation involves the deepest suffering of which the soul is capable.

6. The benefits accruing from acknowledgment of the obligation and an attempt to discharge the resulting duties are also clear. Every man is given a title to the wealth of the material universe. There is great variety in the resource of different sections of the globe, but every man may have all. The very construction of the earth seems to recognize this principle. Seas, oceans, lakes and rivers seem designed to bring the ends of the earth together. The same variety exists in mental endowment. When this principle is acknowledged, every man owns all of the mental world. The same is true in spiritual endowment. God never gave you love, sympathy and feeling to be unused. Holland says: "For a great man a thousand minds are thinking and a thousand hands are working." That man with a telescope is working for me; the other, with his microscope or with his pen, is my servant. All yours is mine on condition that all mine is yours.

7. Owing to the great importance and far-reaching consequences of the doctrine, it is important to inquire how the obligations growing out of mutual responsibility may be best discharged. The question of how is often

made much clearer by considering both its negative and positive aspects.

(1) First, then, let us consider how a man may fail to meet this obligation. It may be done by an overt act of violence. You may rudely strike and wound in the most vulgar way, as did Cain. It may be done by neglect. Your brother may be hungry, but what is that to you? He may be ignorant, but why should you care? He may be sick, but why give yourself any uneasiness on that account? All the nobler impulses of the soul cry out against such inhuman sentiments. It may be done by a failure to develop one's capacity to help. Here so many fail. They do not prepare themselves for service. The prepared man has always been the man most needed, and at no time more than at the present. Finally it may be done by the use of unkind, ungenerous words. In this way wounds may be inflicted that will never heal. The blows that cut the deepest are inflicted by the tongue.

(2) Let us next consider how a man may best meet this obligation. It may be done by protecting his brother from evils and dangers; by warding off the blows that would often fall upon him or by taking the obstruction out of the way. It may be done by the power of a good example. Paul said to Timothy: "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine." Example comes first, and it has wonderful power. It may be done by cultivating love for man, the true basis of which is love for God. Here we reach the highest motive power, but this is occasioned by recognizing God's love for man.

(3) Finally let it be observed that this obligation can be discharged in the most effective way only by a properly qualified man.

First and chief among the qualifications of a true servant is preparation involving his subjective status.

This takes into account the possessions of the man, internal and external. It takes into account what he is and what he has. The former relates to his disposition and feeling, the latter to his ability to give practical expression to his inward principles and desires. The true servant of men is God's man, and God's man is always a large-souled, well-developed man. Here incidentally comes to view the real purpose of education. It is not for the sake of self. It is not a commercial asset, it is not an individual possession. It is for the world's sake.

The truth is clearly indicated in the order of God's questions as thus far propounded. His first question was: "Where art thou?" Man's first duty is to self. "Where am I?" is the first great question that I am called upon to meet. This question must be met and answered before any other question can properly come. Until I find my proper place I am not ready to consider any other question. The second question was: "Where is thy brother?" This is the next question in order of importance. No man can answer this question till he has answered the first. No man will avoid this question who has truly answered the first.

The truth is also clearly established by universal experience. The great helpers of men have been men of large attainments in piety, devotion and knowledge. They have been men who have found themselves. They have come to know who they are, what they are and where they are. They have come into an understanding of the real wants of mankind and of their own ability to provide for those wants. Having heard God's first quesion, they have put themselves into right relations with him and the world, and have thus prepared themselves for a proper answer to the second great question, "Where is thy brother?"

II. The Book of Genesis also reveals the beginning of redemption.

The beautiful picture of man in pristine purity has been displaced by a very dark one. Man, the highest product of the divine workmanship, has been vanquished by the enemy of all righteousness. He has been tested and found wanting. Having forfeited his rich inheritance, he has been banished from his Edenic home. Sin is yielding its bitter fruits in envy, hatred and violence. The hand of God lies heavy upon him in punishment. Henceforth the lot of man is to be one of suffering. Sorrow is now his portion. His heritage is a heritage of tears. But this dark picture is to give place to the bright picture of redemption. Satan's apparent triumph is not to be a final victory. The dark cloud enveloping man is rifted by faint glimmerings of light giving promise of a brighter day. The case is not altogether hopeless, for in connection with the account of man's overthrow the doctrine of redemption appeared. Let us thankfully study this wonderful teaching that here begins to appear which is so full of hope and promise.

1. We have in the Book of Genesis the beginning of redemption as shown in God's great purpose.

(1) The purpose of God is the logical beginning-place for the study of redemption. No work can be understood when separated from the purpose of the author or worker. In a great factory a thousand persons may each be doing a different thing, which, viewed separately, may seem to be an inexplicable or useless thing, but one single, dominant purpose may serve to bring order out of apparent chaos and show the work of each to be an essential part of a complicated whole.

No word or act can be fully understood when dissociated from the thought of speaker or actor. Great

injustice is sometimes done in this way. The purpose of God serves to logically connect and explain the multitude of subsequent acts and actors in the working out of God's great plan of redemption. No single act in this great development can be understood when dissociated from its purpose or dragged from the place it logically holds. The same is true of the various actors in the wonderful drama. This principle must be observed in order to an intelligent understanding of the Bible. It furnishes a complete answer to very many of the objections urged by infidels against the Book of books.

(2) Paul lays much stress on this great purpose of God. Eph. 3:8-11: "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." 2 Tim. 1:9: "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."

Several important truths come out of this. It is declared that this purpose existed before the world began, or prior to man's sin; that it was one of grace and wisdom, involving the question of redemption; that it rested in God's benevolence or philanthropy and not in the fact of human works or merit, and that it was secured through Christ Jesus the Lord.

(3) This great purpose was realized through a grad-

ual method of unfolding. The patriarchal dispensation is the first step in the majestic progress. In this God meets man's threefold need of instruction, atonement and government through the patriarch or great head of the family, who was teacher, priest and ruler. The Mosaic dispensation is the second stage of the development in which God meets this threefold need in his elect nation by creating an office for each function.

In these dispensations human conduct is regulated by outward restraint or law. The final realization of God's purpose of grace is attained in Jesus Christ, who is Prophet, Priest and King of all who will accept him as such.

2. We have in the Book of Genesis the beginning of redemption as shown in verbal promise. Gen. 3:15: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

(1) Redemption in verbal promise is the first point at which God's great plan of salvation becomes known to humanity. The purpose resides wholly in God. In the forming of this we had no part. It originated with God. We can in nowise change it, but we learn God's purpose when it is embodied in promise. Here it touches the human level. Here we approach the point of practical moment to man. The father makes his child a promise, suspending it probably on the performance of certain reasonable and plain conditions. It may be helpful to understand the purpose, but the point of deepest interest and importance consists in the child understanding and performing the conditions on which the blessings of the promise are suspended.

(2) This promise reveals the fact that even God's penalties proceed out of, and are lost in, the divine mercy.

"Cursed by the ground for thy sake." Hard labor is a blessing. Man in the tropics, where he is relieved from labor, tends to the savage state. However it might have been had man not sinned, having sinned, the curse proceeds from mercy and is lost in mercy. Many a man is made by the very hardness of his task. Do not shrink from labor. Do not complain because you have to toil. We put hard labor on the criminal as a penalty. It is, however, more of a mercy than a penalty. This stands here primarily as a curse, but who shall say it was not rather a blessing than curse? Labor existed before the fall; hard or excessive labor came as the result or penalty of the fall. Great lessons take their rise in this: Leisure is safe in proportion to a man's moral purity. Labor is a great restraint on sin. Idleness and sinfulness are boon companions. After man had fallen his labor must be increased. Was not this a mercy?

There was no hope in Satan's curse. A bruised head means final disaster and overthrow. To be bitten in the heel is bad, but, after all, may not good come of it? May he not learn to hate the enemy? "Thou shalt bruise his heel," then he will learn to hate you and will bruise your head. This means conflict, war and final triumph of truth. Suppose the biting had not been decreed; then it would have meant ruin indeed. Intemperance, and no sting! murder, and no remorse! Woe to the world if this were so.

"It shall bruise thy head." Here is the beginning of hope for man. Night had fallen on the world of humanity, yet it had at least one star. This star of hope never ceased to shine until another star stood over the manger at Bethlehem where the infant lay who came to inflict the mortal wound upon the head of the great dragon of sin.

There is still another sign of hope remaining. Man is driven out, and a flaming sword and cherubim are set to guard the gate of entrance into this paradise of peace, yet the tree remains; it was not destroyed. Does this mean that man shall sometime eat. Does it mean that the work of the flaming sword and cherubim was only for a time? Does it mean that on some bright day one who is gentle and tender will lead us back and pluck the ambrosial fruit that we may eat and live forever? It is a mercy that man was not sent out till he could carry some pledge of hope and comfort.

(3) This promise indicates conflict between two persons. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Primarily this "seed" of the woman doubtless refers to Christ. The word occurs in the promise made to Abraham. "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Paul says the word "seed" refers not to many, but to one, which is Christ. It would seem, therefore, that this first promise refers to Christ and his triumph over Satan. The history of Christ's life shows a complete fulfillment of this promise. He began his public life by a contest with Satan, and his whole life was a war with the arch-fiend until the final and complete victory achieved by the resurrection from the dead.

(4) This promise in a secondary sense points to a general conflict between two opposing progenies. Satan has a progeny, a party animated by his spirit. Hence Christ said: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the works of your father ye will do." Christ, the deliverer, has a progeny. "Born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God that liveth and abideth forever." Between these progenies there is con-

flict. "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood." "I came not to send peace, but a sword." This enmity underlies the conflict of the ages. Christ and his seed must and will ever be in conflict with Satan and his seed until righteousness prevail.

(5) This promise contains the germs of all history. In this lie the secrets of human joy and human sorrow. Human joy is the triumph of righteousness. Human sorrow is the triumph of unrighteousness. As to which a man shall have, depends on which principle gains the mastery in him.

In the light of this promise we can understand the meaning of moral, social and political strife. Herein is wrapped up the assurance of the triumph of holiness, the certainty of victory, when the head of the old serpent shall be bruised and evil shall be prostrate in the dust. The serpent's bite and the bruising of his head constitute the conflicts and victories that go to make up human history.

(6) This promise reveals the real nature of evil. His character is shown: It has a head; it is not a vapory, airy nothing. It has intelligence: "The serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." Let no one suppose that evil lacks cunning or smartness. Man's enemy is by no means a weak one.

Its method is declared. It bites the heel. It approaches from behind. It strikes in the dark. It is cunning, underhanded, cowardly. Falsehood, deception and prejudice are its instruments of warfare. Truth can never have a fair field and a free fight.

(7) This promise furnishes a test by which you may try yourself and ascertain your real condition. Is the head of evil bruised in you? If not, all is vain. An

erroneous notion may be cured, a wrong habit changed; but is the desire left unchanged? If your cure has not been radical, it is no cure at all.

Christianity has no mild remedy to propose. It is heroic in its treatment. It does not come with a little court plaster to cure a pimple, as Talmage put it, but it comes with a club to kill the serpent. It offers no compromise; it consents to no armistice; Christ says: "He that is not for me is against me."

(8) This promise furnishes us a guide in warring against wrong. We must direct our efforts against the spirit of wrong rather than against forms of evil. The serpent's head lies in the human heart. You may cure an idea or habit to little purpose. What we need to get at are the moral sympathies and antipathies of the soul.

Herein is the difference, largely, between Judaism and Christianity. Judaism aimed at actions, Christianity aims at the heart. Christ says he that hates is a murderer. The old law was engraven on stone, the new law is written on the fleshly tables of the heart.

(9) This promise is an assurance of the sovereignty of God. Satan plans man's destruction, but God plans his salvation, and God's plan will succeed. Sin came in upon Eden, but redemption came also. Satan may be wise, but God is wiser. Satan is strong, but God is stronger. Satan may triumph temporarily, but God will triumph finally.

The success of Christianity and her final goal is in harmony with this promise. It has been beautifully said: "Guided by the star of Bethlehem, led by the living Christ, illuminated by the lives of saints, consecrated by the blood of martyrs, cheered by the ministry of angels, her course has been a march of triumph, her goal is one of victory."

3. In the Book of Genesis is seen the beginning of redemption as shown in symbol.

Gen. 4: 3-8: "And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering; but unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. And the Lord said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin croucheth at the door: and unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him. And Cain told Abel his brother. And it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain arose up against Abel his brother, and slew him."

(1) The preaching of the gospel is almost as old as man. Paul says the gospel was preached to Abraham. This was a gospel in promise, but this was not the first time the gospel was thus preached. It was preached to Eve in verbal promise, as we have seen. The second gospel sermon was preached in significant symbol. The smoking altar is almost as old as the race, because sin is almost coeval with man. Every blood-offering is a homily on sin and a hint or promise of salvation. The gospel is God's answer to the want or craving superinduced by sin. It is glad tidings, because it is hope for despair, because it is life for death. Without the gospel man is shut up in a dungeon of despondency.

(2) The gospel in symbol is as certain and unmistakable as is the express verbal declaration of Holy Writ. God's promise in word is no surer than his promise in symbol. In nature this truth is amply illustrated. The egg is a promise of the bird, the seed of the plant, the boy

of the man. The bleeding animal is an eloquent prophecy of the bleeding Christ. It is also an impressive declaration of the fact that life is forfeited by sin. Prophecy in symbol is an illustration of God's twofold method of teaching; word-lesson and object-lesson. God never rests the case upon the simple verbal statement of truth. It is promise in word, then in symbol. It is eloquent word and still more eloquent practice. He tells us what to do and then shows how to do it. Herein lies the immeasurable superiority of Christianity over all philosophical systems. Philosophy is a doctrine; Christianity is a life as the outgrowth of a doctrine. Philosophy divorces theory and practice; Christianity marries theory and practice. Philosophy says hear and understand; Christianity says hear and do. In order to accomplish this result, Christianity seeks to arouse and enlist the affections that the necessary impulse to action may be begotten.

(3) This history leads us to the conclusion that sacrifice is not a human invention. The divine origin of sacrifice is supported by abundant proof. It is antecedently probable that God would instruct man as to what would constitute acceptable worship. Worship is instinctive. It finds its basis in man's nature. Its universality is a proof of the inherent necessity. All men worship. Even those who ridicule the idea of worship are themselves worshipers. Man will either worship the God of revelation or create his own god. It is highly improbable that God would disregard a universal impulse. God always meets the wants that he creates, or, in other words, that are native to man. Eyes are met by light and an external world, ears by sound, lungs by air, hunger by food, thirst by water, the social instinct by companionship, the religious instinct by God.

It is the logical sequence of the hope inspired by verbal promise. God never awakens hope simply to allow it to perish. Not only does God try to beget hope in the soul, but he tries to keep it alive in every possible way. Hope never dies by God's fault. To man in his present environment hope is a great necessity. In the New Testament hope is called the "anchor of the soul." Without hope the soul drifts like a vessel without an anchor. There is no picture more sad than that of man without hope. The hearth with its dead ashes, left after the guests of light and love have gone, is a fit emblem of the heart bereft of hope.

It is the conclusion growing out of the fact that care for the less implies care for the greater. God cared for man's physical wants. Food and clothing were provided. May we not reasonably expect that God will care for the real man that dwells in the tenement called the body? To doubt this is to disbelieve in God. To doubt this is to disbelieve in the real greatness of man.

Man left to himself could scarcely have invented such a system so early in his history. Here we find the first family coming before God in a settled order of worship. This fact can only be explained on the hypothesis that God had appointed it. Time is an important factor in a natural spontaneous development. Man with a religious nature would doubtless have developed a religion in time, but here the time element seems to have been largely lacking. Does not this fact point to the divine origin of sacrifice?

Of all conceivable methods of worship, that of shedding the blood of an animal is the least likely to have originated in the human mind. Rejecting the much more natural method of approach by bringing fruit

and flowers, man slays an animal. Did this originate in the mind of man?

Such worship has no significance only as it is symbolical. Sacrifice is not merely a gift. It is that and much more. Christ's sufferings give sacrifice its meaning. Adam could know nothing of this. God alone could know, and hence arrange a suitable symbol. Divine acceptance points to a divine appointment. How else can God's discrimination be explained? How else can we avoid impeaching divine justice? Abel's offering was one of faith. He received the testimony that he was righteous. His act was called right. Nothing can make a positive act right but the law of the rightful sovereign. Paul says: "By faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." He offered it in a believing, trusting spirit. Hence he had testimony. Faith in a positive act must be based on testimony.

(4) The peculiarities of Cain's religion are shown by his offering. It was a religion that had some good in it. It acknowledged the existence of a Divine Providence. It acknowledged human obligation. Cain brought a gratitude-offering. There is no religion, however false, but that has some good. Skeptics point out the good in Buddhism, Mohammedism and other religions. Were there no good in them they could not exist for a day.

It was a religion of expediency. It was assumed largely, no doubt, for appearance's sake. There are many such persons even now. Many subordinate their religion to their own convenience or to purely selfish interests. If God made the soul, he can best provide for its wants. It is best to accept God's religion, which is adapted by the Creator to the

creature, and consequently perfectly suited to his needs and requirements.

It was a religion abounding in self-righteousness. It ignored the very existence of sin. It recognized no breach between man and God. Some hold these same views yet. Atheistic evolution is only Cain's religion in modern dress.

It was a persecuting religion, which is true of all human religions. It could tolerate no views but its own, and hence soon stained its hands with blood. The divine religion is meek and forbearing; that of man, vindictive and bloody. The more heavenly a religion is, the more charitable it is. The human is always narrow. The divine is generous.

It was an envious religion. Abel's sacrifice being accepted filled Cain with bitter envy. It is the same spirit that prompted Satan to tempt man to fall. Abel's acceptance did not hinder Cain from receiving a blessing. Had his religion been good he would have rejoiced to see Abel accepted. Sometimes churches professing the religion of Christ manifest the same spirit. It is all from the devil, even though seen in churches professing the religion of Christ. Never try to rise by pulling down some other person.

(5) The characteristics of Abel's religion are shown by his offering.

It embodied all the good there was in that of Cain. Some contend that the passage should read: "Abel brought it also and of the firstlings of his flock." According to this rendering, it would appear that Abel brought the gratitude-offering, and the sin-offering in addition. Thus it would appear that the great elements of true religion are here disclosed; namely, adoration, consciousness of sin and a consequent plea

for mercy and an expression of gratitude to the Giver of all good. This meant that sin deserved death. There was no self-righteousness in this: It said: "I am a sinner." Here all true religion begins.

It was a religion actuated by faith; it trusted God's mercy, confided in his wisdom and relied on his power. Abel is thus placed at the head of the very household of faith.

It was a germinal religion. It looked forward to a better and fuller system. Christ was in Abel's religion like the tree lies in the acorn; like the harvest in the kernel of wheat. Abel may not have seen this: we see it because we have seen the tree that has come from the acorn, yet Abel did his act in faith, and hence deserves the blessing.

It was a religion approved of God. "He obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying to his gifts." Divine approval is the highest of all good. Many care more for human approval, but if God approves, it matters not what man may say.

CHAPTER XVI.

Beginnings as Revealed in Genesis—The Beginning of Religion and of Judgment.

1. He who writes the history of religion writes the history of the race. Religion is one of the most universal facts of life. The religious principle may safely be regarded as a native instinct or propensity, and as such it demands satisfaction. We may therefore reasonably expect to see manifestations of this propensity all along the line of human history in efforts made for its gratification. We may also expect that the Creator would provide for this constitutional factor of the human soul.

2. We therefore find that the history of religion divides itself into two parts: First, natural religion, by which I mean the efforts made by man to gratify, and give expression to, his religious propensity; and, second, the authoritative revelation of a religion designed by the Creator for his creature man. We would also expect this natural religion in some degree, however imperfect, to answer to this propensity, while we would certainly expect the revealed religion to meet the demand in a most perfect way.

In harmony with a reasonable expectation:

I. We have in the Book of Genesis a history of the beginning of natural religion.

And in process of time it came to pass that "Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the

Lord. . . . If thou doest well, shalt not thou be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin croucheth at the door" (Gen. 4: 3-7).

1. The principle of natural religion is intrinsically good when applied under proper conditions. It consists in doing well: practical goodness is the idea involved. This is the noblest principle in the universe: for this was man created. Every function of mind and body was designed to secure this result. The individual that does well both pleases and glorifies God, just as the machine that does its work well both pleases and glorifies its maker. But man can glorify his Creator in a much higher way, because he acts from choice and volition. He does not act under necessity, but in the freedom of his will he moves in harmony with the will of God.

In this we have a practical hint; man glorifies God in what he does. To do well is to reflect credit upon the Creator.

2. It is a principle which calls for highest approval. If all did well, this world would be immensely changed. No police nor soldiers, no prisons nor houses of reform, no oppression nor injustice, no lying nor slander, no fraud nor deceit, no theft nor violence, no drunkenness nor murder, no wars nor conflicts. If all did well, this world would be "paradise regained." Many good principles are objected to for practical reasons. They may interfere with interests, personal or otherwise. They may interfere with cherished institutions. Reformations have thus been retarded, but to this principle no one can object: God would smile upon it, angels would applaud it, and the world would ring with its praises.

3. It is a principle of rigid and exacting requirements. Every requirement of the moral law must be fulfilled. There must be no transgression, but, on the contrary, full obedience. There must be no rebellion, but complete service. One must not only not hate one's neighbor, but love him. Perfect compliance demands: that the act be perfect; that the motive be good—there are many seeming acts of benevolence; that the rule be good—the good thing done as God directs. Conduct must conform to God's will without the slightest variation, that the whole life be good—not one single deviation.

4. Obedience to this principle is attended with most gracious rewards. "Shall not thou be accepted?" It secures God's approval, which is the highest of all motives. It secures one's own approval, which is a condition of peace. It secures the approval of all good people, which is a source of deep satisfaction.

It secures immortality, which is the highest reward. Sin entered the world and death by sin. To avoid the sin is to escape death.

Let us now inquire who are the real subjects of this religion, manifestly first of all:

Angels: they do well, sin not. Next, man in his unfallen state—Adam and Eve before they fell, but certainly not sinful man. Cain in a fallen state tried the religion of unfallen beings, and in this he failed. As a sinner he made no recognition of sin. There was no blood sacrifice.

Fallen man is not a subject of this religion. If you doubt this, examine yourself: Have you obeyed every precept? Do you plead guilty or not? If you are guilty, Cain's religion is not for you.

Let us consider sin: it means to miss the mark.

As to its nature: It is an infraction of the best laws; it is rebellion against the King; it is ingratitude to the noblest friend; opposition to the tenderest father; it is insult to divine authority. As to its effects: It has wounded the affection and grieved the heart of God. It has alienated the heart from the true object of affection. It has perverted the judgment, clouded the reason, arrayed man against man, filled the soul with a sense of guilt, shame and dreadful forebodings. As to its consequences: The effects here are awful, but more terrible are the consequences to follow. The forebodings of conscience are the prophecies of the future, the mutterings of the approaching storm. The worm, quenchless fire, bottomless pit and burning lake are but faint images of the condition of the sin-destroyed soul.

5. Natural religion offers no way of escape. It has no remedy. If repentance be suggested, I answer repentance can not undo wrong and replace things as they were. Tears and groans can not honor a violated law, nor can change of purpose make good the wrong done. If reformation be suggested, I answer: reformation can not alter the past. To incur no new debt will not pay off the old. Listen to Mic. 6:6: "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousand rivers of oil? shall I give my firstborn for my transgressions, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" Listen to the answer: "Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering."

If mercy be suggested, I answer: God is infinite in

mercy, but mercy and justice must somewhere meet. Order must not be jeopardized. God must respect his own law, and so mercy must find a way that will not sanction sin or countenance rebellion. What can be done? Here natural religion leaves man in midnight gloom: she has no scheme of redemption to propose. "The deep saith, It is not in me; and the sea saith, It is not in me." All creation echoes the despairing cry, "It is not in me." Wisdom can not discover it, gold can not buy it, and nature knows not the price thereof. Just here, when hope seems dead, a remedy is offered; just here help comes to the sinking heart of shipwrecked humanity in the form of a religion divinely chosen to meet the dire necessity.

II. We have in the Book of Genesis the beginning of revealed religion.

"If thou doest not well, a sin offering reposes at the door."

1. Revealed religion assumes that men are guilty, as was stated in a previous chapter; the Bible nowhere tries to prove this. It is unnecessary: we never try to prove the self-confessed murderer guilty. Christ said: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance." "There is none righteous, no, not one." This statement is indisputable. That men are liable to punishment is a necessary corollary of this. In fact, sentence has already been passed. What man needs is commutation of sentence, and revealed religion shows how this may be obtained.

2. It has provided a sin-offering: man is not left to his own resources. The Jews had three kinds of offerings: Peace-offering, a recognition of friendship; eucharistic or gratitude offering, and piacular or aton-

ing offerings, which were most important of all. The nature of this sin-offering is shown: "And Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin offering, and shall make an atonement; for it is the blood that maketh atonement of the soul." This is the kind of offering mentioned here. It involved the idea of substitution. This doctrine has been ridiculed, yet it is often acted upon in practical life. One man becomes a substitute for another in the army. Parent substitutes his own labor for that of the child. Every mouthful the child eats preaches the doctrine of substitution. Leonidas and his Spartans became substitutes. The King of the Locrians gave an eye for that of his son. There was substitution of person; Christ took our place; God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for man. "The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many." "God sent his Son . . . to redeem them that were under the law." There was substitution of guilt: the scapegoat was a type of Christ bearing our sin. "He bore in his own body our sins upon the tree." There was substitution of suffering; the innocent victim was slain for the guilty. "Christ died for the ungodly," suffered for us," "was made a curse for us." This also explains why God withdrew his presence from Christ on the cross. Sin separates between man and God, and hence, when our sins were laid on Christ, a separation between him and God took place. The acceptance of the sin-offering was accompanied by divine evidence. It was so in the case of Aaron and Moses when they presented the offering for the people. This acceptance signified that the people should live. So, too, Calvary's sacrifice has been accepted: the descent of the Spirit signified the acceptance of Christ's sacrifice. The sacrifice being accepted, the sinner is

treated as if he himself had suffered. For thousands of years the law cried: "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." Christ's blood alone satisfied the demand. Now the sinner is treated as if he were innocent. This transfer of benefit is common; one man is received for the sake of another. The Prince intercedes for the rebellious subject. It should be borne in mind that the animal sacrifices under the Mosaic dispensation did not take away sin. They were symbolic. They pointed forward to the sacrifice of Christ, which alone was efficacious. Under Moses there was remembrance of sin every year. Sin was rolled forward a year at a time till Christ could come and die for the sins of the world.

3. This sin-offering reposeth at the door: "Sin lieth at the door," or, as it has been translated, "A sin-offering reposeth at the door." This implies that Christ's atonement is accessible to the sinner. Cain had only to cross the threshold to get the divinely provided lamb. This points to the fact that every encouragement is given to man to avail himself of Christ's sacrifice. Christ is neither too high nor too low, but within the reach of all. It implies that it rests with man to avail himself of this sacrifice. The offering was at Cain's door, but he must take it. So, also, of the atonement: it must be used to be efficacious. Providence sends the breeze; the sailor must spread the sails. God gives fruit, harvest, raiment, but man must take or perish. No man can make atonement, but he can accept that which is made. It implies that men neglect the atonement. How long the beast had lain there we know not, but Cain had neglected it. That men neglect Christ's atonement is one of the strangest and most awful facts of history. In view of this, the prophet

said: "He is despised and rejected of men." Jesus said: "All day long have I stretched forth my hands." "Behold, I stand at the door and knock." It implies that God is very patient. "Reposeth at the door." Before the doors of some, the offering has lain for years. But it has been despised. This sacrifice has lain at the door of your heart since you knew right from wrong. It implies that man can not be lost without trampling this sacrifice under foot. God has thrown an obstruction in the road to ruin. Jesus has flung himself across the path to destruction. He says, before you are lost you must trample on me. It implies that those who are lost are without excuse. Salvation was within reach, yet he despised it. The man who goes to ruin does so with the offer of pardon ringing in his ears. Opportunity was his. The atonement was perfect. The ability was his. He must say, I stood at the door of mercy and refused to enter. I stood by the fountain and refused to drink. I have despised the offering. Well may such an one call on the rocks and mountains to fall on him and hide him from the presence of the Lord.

III. We have in the Book of Genesis the beginning of judgment.

The first great judgment inflicted upon the race is recorded in the history of the flood, in which the entire human family perished except the family of Noah, consisting of eight persons. This would seem to be a terrible outcome considering man's promising beginning. A better beginning or a more woful ending can not well be imagined. We may, however, draw some valuable lessons from the sad fate of the antediluvian world.

1. The Bible records briefly trace two lines of Adam's descendants in which opposite characteristics are displayed:

(1) One line, descended from Seth through Enoch to Noah, was distinguished during a long period for piety and righteousness. The knowledge of the true God was preserved and a true religion maintained at least in one family of the line. In consequence of this, these descendants of Adam are called in the sacred record, "sons of God." This term is elsewhere applied in the Scriptures to godly men, and it is entirely appropriate. Those who in character and conduct show themselves to be worthy of their high origin may with propriety be called "sons of God."

(2) Another line, descended from Cain, was distinguished for impiety and constantly increasing godlessness and corruption. These are not dignified by a name suggesting divine origin, but are called simply men. Their daughters are called "daughters of men." This name, used in contrast with the phrase "sons of God," indicates their carnal proclivities. This line seems also to have been characterized by ingenuity, as it is credited with the invention of musical instruments and brass and iron implements. They were doubtless an active, intellectual people that excelled in art, music, and worldly accomplishments in general, but were destitute of the higher graces of goodness, mercy, purity, and the love of God out of which these graces spring. Such examples are not infrequent either in the history of individuals or nations. Often great intellectuality and the deepest moral degradation have been found associated in the same persons or people. Lord Bacon may be cited as an example of the former and the Grecian nation of the latter.

Here we see two streams flowing from the same fountain—one bitter and the other sweet. This account might seem unnatural did we not see the same thing repeated before our eyes continually. How often two brothers, two sisters, children of the same parents, reared under the same influences, display exactly opposite characteristics and reach opposite destinies.

2. The brief Bible account of these two lines of Adam's descendants reveals the potent cause of the destruction of the antediluvian world.

(1) There is a point in wickedness beyond which man can not go without involving himself in complete ruin and the forfeiting of divine favor. "My Spirit shall not strive with man for ever." This has often been illustrated in the history of nations. Sin has generally been the cause of national overthrow. God has shown himself to be longsuffering and patient. He permits nations to go to great lengths in sin and corruption, not, however, without sounding many warnings, but there is a point beyond which no nation can go without involving itself in ruin. When that limit is reached, the destruction is sure and swift.

If human wickedness brings national disaster and ruin, it is also true that righteousness is the saving principle. Righteous men are the salt that saves the nation. This is universally true. In family, social and political life, righteousness saves and sin destroys. Often the righteous element that saves is very small. God offered to spare Sodom if ten righteous persons could be found. He spared the antediluvian world until but one righteous family was left. But, however long judgment may be delayed, the limit to which wickedness may go is finally reached, and then the thunderbolt of God's wrath descends. God says, bet-

ter not live than to live in such a state. It is more merciful to destroy than to preserve when righteousness has entirely departed.

(2) The cause of the general apostasy of the righteous line of Adam's descendants is clear from the Bible record. "And it came to pass when men began to multiply on the face of the ground, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose." As the race multiplied, the families of Cain and Seth came into close proximity, and as a result there was intermarriage. The daughters of the Cainites, distinguished for beauty, and for culture in music and arts, won the hearts of the sons of God, or the Sethites. "They took them wives of all that they chose." Their choice was based on beauty and outward graces and adornment rather than on the graces of the heart. The flesh triumphed over the spirit, and ruin followed swift and sure. Family life degenerated when the motherhood became corrupt. This social fall was analogous to the first or individual fall. Eve saw the fruit of the tree "that it was pleasant to the eye," and she partook. "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair." In both cases sense triumphed over reason. In both cases the ruin was wrought by the agency of woman.

(3) These Scriptural facts reveal the marvelous power of woman. Man has never been able to sustain himself morally, independent of woman. In the beginning when woman fell man fell. Later on in the history, when the sons of God undertook to establish families by marrying corrupt women, all were involved in ruin together. So it has ever been. It is, however,

very encouraging to know that woman's elevating power is no less than her power to drag down. "A good wife is from the Lord," and a virtuous womanhood is the corner-stone of social purity. No society can long withstand the debasing influence of corrupt womanhood nor the elevating tendencies of virtuous womanhood. It also stands to the honor of woman that although capable of great debasement, she is also susceptible of the highest intellectual, moral and spiritual elevation. The necessary corollary growing out of this is, that the elevating of woman is the surest and speediest way to moral reforms.

(4) In the history here given, the real unit of national life is clearly seen. The family is shown to be the true national unit. A nation can be built up only by adding family to family. This truth cuts the ground from under socialistic schemes and theories that disregard the sanctity of the marriage relation. It follows that the surest way to destroy the nation is to corrupt the family, and that the most effective way to strengthen the nation is to elevate the family. It also follows that whatever inflicts injury on the family is a national sin. Two such sins are conspicuous in our national life at the present time: The liquor traffic—there is no business so unpatriotic as this; and loose divorce laws. Here, again, the wonderful power of woman is supreme: she is queen of the home. Most persons owe far more to their mothers than they do to their fathers. The father may be taken away and the home be still maintained, but when mother is gone the family must be broken up or another mother provided. How true the sentiment, "What is home without a mother?" These facts reveal to woman her first and highest duty. There is no call that comes to the mother that is so

loud as the call of duty to her own family. She who neglects her own home or her own children for the sake of social life or of charity is actuated by mistaken ideas of woman's sphere. She is sacrificing the greater for the less. This does not mean that a woman can do nothing for the world outside of her own family, but it does mean that a woman with a family may by mistaken notions of philanthropy lose her greatest opportunity for good.

3. God's agency of reform has been the same under all dispensations.

(1) The primary agent of reform is the Spirit of God. "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." This word here rendered "strive" means to convince or convict. It is an effect wrought upon the judgment or will of man. God never disregards or outrages man's free agency. He strives to convince and thus influence the will. There is no more exalted view of humanity than the one here presented—God striving to convince or persuade. God never insults the faculties he has created.

(2) The instrument that God's Spirit uses for the salvation of man is man. Man is secondary, but indispensable. God's Spirit strove with the antediluvian world through the preaching of Noah. He appealed to human reason by human persuasion, exhortation and warning. God has always resorted to this same process. God's Spirit strove to reform Israel by means of prophets who spoke the divine message of instruction and warning. God is seeking to reform the world to-day by means of men sent to declare the divine message.

(3) Destruction is preceded by the withdrawal of God's Spirit. This is true in individual and collective

life. God's Spirit will strive through his chosen agents up to a certain point; then, if reformation is not accomplished, God's effort ceases and destruction follows. In this case God said, "I will wait one hundred and twenty years," from which we conclude that God's striving will not cease as long as hope remains. This withdrawal is not an arbitrary act of God's sovereignty. In fact, man may be said to bring about this terrible result by his own action. A person may so long disregard the message, so long stifle his own convictions, that the message fails longer to make any impression. Then it may be truly said God's Spirit has ceased to strive with that person.

(4) We may learn that destruction awaits everything that fails of the accomplishment of its intended purpose. Everything is intended for wise and useful ends. This truth finds highest application in the case of man. The dignity of man points to the greatness of his mission. The meanest worm that crawls has a useful mission; how much greater the mission of him who was made in the divine image. The accomplishment of this mission is the only justification for existence. God has no room in this world for a useless thing. Usefulness gives the only valid title to a place in world. We may therefore conclude that to fail in the accomplishment of the end of being means to insure destruction. Judgment is the last act of divine mercy exercised in behalf of the useless thing.

PART IV.

The Separate Books of the Pentateuch.

CHAPTER XVII.

The Book of Genesis.

1. In entering upon a discussion of the separate books of the Pentateuch, I will say, by way of preface, that the writings will be treated as veritable history in all essential particulars. If at any point fable or allegory is introduced—as, for instance, the story of the temptation in the Garden of Eden, as is claimed by some—I shall not attempt to disprove this claim, as I do not consider that it in any way discredits the historic character of the narrative in its essential and deeper meanings. The significant historical fact is that man fell, not from inward impulse, but through outward suggestion, proceeding from a malevolent spirit, the bodily form of the agent being an item in the history of minor importance. True, there are some points in the story that do not lend themselves readily to the allegorical theory, but I do not think they are necessarily irreconcilable with that hypothesis. In any event, the great historic truths of the creation, temptation and fall of man are presented in a very clear, graphic and forceful manner. In short, the account is dramatic in the highest sense.

2. It will also be seen that the claim for the historical character of the opening portion of Genesis necessarily carries with it the claim for the miraculous inspiration of the writer, since the events recorded could not have been personally known to him, antedating as they do the creation of man. And even

after man appeared, for a considerable period the facts of history recorded must have been directly revealed, since it is scarcely probable that records were kept from the beginning and during the earlier ages and probably not before the flood. Later, as the time of the fathers of the Hebrew people is approached, detached records and documents may have come into existence to which Moses may have had access, and, if so (and this purely hypothetical), this inspiration of the writer would involve a supernatural guidance in selecting the true and that which was necessary to the divine purpose, and in rejecting the false and that which was not germane to said purpose.

In brief, then, we shall treat the whole Pentateuchal narrative as divinely inspired history, which we veritably believe it to be.

3. As to when Moses produced the book we have no means of knowing: Some think that he wrote it in Midian before the Exodus, the immediate purpose being to comfort his enslaved brethren in Egypt, while others, and I think with better reason, incline to the opinion that he wrote it during the wilderness march after the giving of the law from Sinai, probably having received his instructions from God in the holy mount when the pattern of the tabernacle and the details of the Mosaic economy were committed to him.

With these preliminary remarks we will consider:

I. The character of the Book of Genesis.

1. It is the oldest trustworthy writing in the world. It contains all we know of the human race from the creation up to the time of Moses. No other writing makes any such claim as to age.* Homer, the most

* Henry's Bible, Vol. 1., Preface.

ancient heathen writer, lived about 750 B. C., which was about seven hundred years later than Moses, and his writings are not in any sense historical. Authentic heathen history begins with Herodotus and Thucydides, who lived about 500 B. C., nine hundred years after Moses' times, and even in this history there is much that is obscure and uncertain, and it presents a marked contrast to the tone of confidence and assurance that characterizes the writings of Moses. Is not this indicative of the inspiration claimed for these writings.

2. It is far superior in every respect to the sacred writings of all other nations. The cosmogony of Genesis has a dignity and serious quality utterly lacking in that of other ancient nations. The mythologies of ancient peoples is trivial and childish in comparison with the account of creation in Genesis, and they all end in pantheism, polytheism or materialism. Here, again, is a fact pointing to inspiration, and in utter conflict with the doctrine of evolution, which makes monotheism (the doctrine of Genesis) the lineal descendant of polytheism, but Genesis makes monotheism antedate polytheism at least, historically considered, by a matter of seven or eight hundred years. The only way to avoid this conclusion is to carry forward the Pentateuch till the time of Josiah or later, and even this attempt breaks down, since that theory demands hypothetical documents much older than any ancient heathen writings, and these must have been monotheistic, since they are claimed as the basis of the Pentateuch. The Vedas of the Hindoos, the Zendavesta of the Persians, and the Yih-King of the Chinese, can in no way compare with the sublime, serious history of Genesis.* The former is a col-

*Smith's Bible Dictionary, article "Genesis"; "Encyclopedia Bib. Lit." (Kitto), article "Genesis."

lection of hymns mingled with legends; the second is a mere speculation as to the origin of things; while the latter is an incoherent mass of writings incapable of being comprehended, or, rather, capable of being twisted into almost any sort of cosmological theory or ethical philosophy. At least, this is the testimony of those competent to pass an original judgment in the case. On the contrary, Genesis is a dignified history, worthy in its character of the divine origin claimed for it.

II. The unity of the book.

It is unnecessary to discuss the various theories as to the manner in which the book was produced. The leading divisive hypotheses are: The document hypothesis, the fragment hypothesis, the supplement hypothesis, the crystalization hypothesis, the modified document hypothesis and the development hypothesis.* The number of these hypotheses is a suspicious circumstance, and shows the lack of agreement between the critics. The theories are all destructive in their nature, even in their mildest or most conservative form. We may, therefore, safely conclude that the old view as to the origin of the Pentateuch, held universally by Jews, Christians and scholars generally for two thousand years, until a comparatively recent time, ought not, and can not, be set aside by improved hypotheses, concerning which even the critics themselves are in dispute.

The unity of the book need not be dwelt on at this point, since it is involved in the unity of the Pentateuch, a necessary corollary of the Mosaic authorship, argued in previous chapters of this book. It was

* "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch" (Green), pp. 61-144.

shown that the various divisive hypotheses put forth to prove that a plurality of documents, of different origins, enter into the Pentateuch, can not be accepted, because the arguments relied on do not yield the support claimed for them.

1. It was pointed out that the alternate occurrence in alternate sections of the two terms used for God, "Elohim" and "Jehovah," a phenomenon especially noticeable in the early chapters of Genesis, does not furnish proof that two independent documents had been chopped up and mechanically pieced together to form one document and falsely ascribed to Moses, since the canon relied on breaks down in numerous places and is hence precarious at best. In other words, neither name can be rigidly confined to the sections to which by hypothesis it belongs, Jehovah appearing in Elohim sections and *vice versa*.*

2. It was pointed out that the argument of the two names of God has a different content or application, and that they are always used with discrimination and in a manner adapted to the sense of the passage in which they are found. It was pointed out that the argument for the composite character of the Pentateuch based on the alleged reproduction of the two original documents by replacing the sundered fragments in their original settings loses its force by the fact that the professedly reconstructed documents are characterized by chasms and sudden transitions that can be consistently filled only by the very passages separated out and assigned to the one or the other document.

Furthermore, it was shown that what has been done with Genesis by the critics can be done with

* See "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch" (Green) pp. 99; 127; also "Cyclo. Bib. Lit. (Kitto), Vol. I, article "Genesis," for a discussion of the matter found on this and subsequent page.

other documents the unity of which no one denies or questions.*

3. The argument based on the claim that there are duplicate accounts of the same events or stories, as, for instance, the accounts of creation and the flood, is shown by Professor Green and others to be based on a fiction, since the alleged duplications are really separate accounts by the same writer, varying in some of the details and introduced for clearly distinct purposes.

4. Finally, the argument from differences of style and diction may be cast to the winds, since some of the prominent advocates of the divisive theory frankly say that it has but little force. At best it is very uncertain, and even in its most plausible dress it involves reasoning in a circle, the differences being first created and then used as arguments to show diversity of authorship.

Aside from all other considerations, can any one imagine that separate independent documents could be so pieced together as to produce such a book as Genesis, in which there is a clearly discoverable unity of purpose and plan from first to last? Common sense rejects the idea as involving a literary impossibility, if not a literary miracle. We hold, therefore, that the unity of Genesis has not been, and can not be, successfully disputed.

The general effect of all the divisive theories is much the same. All rob the Pentateuch of any historic value, and are irreconcilable with any theory of inspiration that places the Bible on a plane above that of any and all other books. The reception of any of

these theories is incompatible with faith in the Bible as a superhuman book, or logic has no meaning. This fact was clearly apprehended by their rationalistic authors.

III. Is the Book of Genesis in conflict with science?

Upon this point there is much dispute, and it may not be amiss to state in a general way the opposite positions taken.

1. Rationalistic critics, and even the advocates of the divisive hypothesis who claim to believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures, see an irreconcilable conflict between some of the teachings of the Book of Genesis and the doctrines of science. To show the position taken by the latter, I select a few passages from the Expositors' Bible, article on Genesis: "If any one is in search of accurate information regarding the age of this earth, or its relations to the sun and moon and stars, or regarding the order in which plants and animals have appeared upon it, he is referred to recent text-books in astronomy, geology and palæontology. No one for a moment dreams of referring a serious student of these subjects to the Bible as a source of information. It is not the object of the writers of Scripture to impart physical instruction or to enlarge the ground of scientific knowledge. . . . If his (the writer's) object was to give an intelligible account of God's relations to the world and to man, then it must be owned that he has been successful in the highest degree."

Going upon the assumption that there is lack of agreement between the Bible and science, he defends the Bible as follows: "As well might we deny to Shakespeare a masterly knowledge of human life be-

cause his dramas are blotted by historical anachronisms. The compiler of this book did not aim at scientific accuracy in speaking of physical details, as is obvious. . . . Indeed, what we mean by scientific knowledge was not in all the thoughts of the people for whom this book was written."

Speaking of the attempts to bring Genesis into harmony with science, he says: "All attempts to force its statements into such harmony are futile and mischievous; they are futile because they do not convince independent inquirers; and they are mischievous because they unduly prolong the strife between Scripture and science, putting the question on a false issue. And above all they are to be condemned because they do violence to the Scripture, foster a style of interpretation by which the text is forced to say whatever the interpreter desires, and prevents us from recognizing the real nature of the sacred writings. If, for example, the word 'day' in these chapters (first and second of Genesis) does not mean a period of twenty-four hours, the interpretation of Scripture is hopeless. Indeed, if we are to bring these chapters into any comparison at all with science, we find at once various discrepancies. Of a creation of sun, moon and stars, subsequent to the creation of the earth, science can have but one thing to say." That the Scriptures say no such thing, will become apparent as we advance.

Much more is said in support of the claim that the Bible is not in harmony with science and in explanation of the book as viewed from that standpoint. The author of the article evidently thinks he has made a triumphant defense of the Bible, regarded as an unscientific book. It is strange that men who write in

this way should have gained the reputation of being scholars.

2. It may, on the other hand, be freely admitted that the primary purpose of the Bible is not to teach physical or even mental science; that it is not a text-book on geology or botany or astronomy, or any other scientific subject; yet may we not reasonably expect that such reference to the physical world as is incidentally made shall not contradict the certain and generally accepted facts of science as they have been or may be definitely ascertained?

Especially is it true that a cosmogony such as is set forth in the early chapters of Genesis should, at least in its general outlines, conform to the plain teachings of science. Therefore, if an apparent conflict exists, as some claim, it does not raise the presumption that our interpretation of Scripture statements is wrong, or that the "facts of science" involving the conflict are after all subject to revision. Furthermore, if the Scripture statements that are in seeming conflict with science can be reasonably interpreted so as to remove the conflict, is this not better than to admit a conflict and then invent theories as to the nature of Scripture that may be accepted without a surrender of faith in them as a divine revelation, and especially since experience has shown that these theories have done much to weaken or destroy the faith of many? Moreover, if a seeming conflict be admitted, it strengthens the position of the enemies of revelation, since it is seized upon by the skeptic as an additional reason for rejecting the doctrine of inspiration.

3. One thing more may well be taken into consideration in this connection; namely, the changing of scientific theories that is continually going on. Some

of the theories once generally accepted are now called in question, and some of the theories in favor to-day will probably be denied to-morrow. For instance, the nebular hypothesis not long since, and even now, held in great esteem, must at present compete for favor with the planetary hypothesis.

The former accounts for our solar system by hypothecating a highly heated, greatly attenuated, nebulous mass of immense proportions, extending far beyond our remotest planets, yea, even beyond our most distant fixed stars, set to revolving by contraction resulting from cooling on the outer surface. In this way an envelope denser than the central portion was formed, which broke loose from the part within by reason of its greater density, and then broke asunder at its weakest point and rolled up into a ball, thus forming a planet, still highly heated, but gradually shrinking in size by cooling until finally it passed from the gaseous to the liquid and then to the solid state, at least on the outside, such as is now the condition of our earth and other planets of our solar system. This process continued to be repeated at successive intervals until all of the planets of our system were formed, leaving the central portion as a sun. The satellites of the earth, Jupiter and other planets are accounted for by supposing that the planet when thrown off repeated the process of the parent mass that had given it birth. This theory, plausible as it may seem, does not stand unchallenged. A rival hypothesis accounts for the planets by assuming that little nuclei were formed here and there in the great nebulous mass (just how is not explained), that gradually grew by attracting the neighboring matter until all had been appropriated except little patches here

and there that now constitute those interesting wanderers called comets. As to whether one of these theories shall finally hold the field, or some other that will better account for all the phenomena, remains to be seen. Probably the question will never be settled, but until some definite and certain conclusion is reached, is it necessary to declare the Bible in conflict with science unless it be on some scientific points fixed beyond the peradventure of a doubt, and then only after it is shown that the language of Scripture can not be reasonably interpreted in harmony with the established scientific fact?

4. As an instance in point, take the assertion referred to above copied from the Expositors' Bible. In citing the first and second chapters of Genesis, the writer says: "If, for example, the word 'day' in these chapters does not mean a period of twenty-four hours, the interpretation of Scripture is hopeless." One feels like saying, "Who told him that?" Certainly the Hebrew word *yom,* translated "day," does not always mean a period of twenty-four hours. Daniel uses the period of a day as representing a year when he speaks of the seventy weeks (490 years) that were allotted to his people before their special prerogatives would be taken away. Jacob worked a week for each of his wives, which we are told in the same connection was seven years. Here a day stands for a year.

In Ezekiel, chapter 4, a day is used to symbolize a year. "I have appointed the years of their iniquity to be unto thee a number of days; even three hundred and ninety days." Again in the same connection: "When thou hast accomplished these thou shalt lie on thy right side, and shall bear the iniquity of the house of Judah; forty days a day for a year have I appointed

it unto thee." We also read of the day of temptation in the wilderness; but the wilderness experience was forty years. As a matter of fact, the word *yom* is used to indicate an indefinite period; it may be twelve hours or twenty-four hours, or a year, or forty years, or a much longer time. Then, why the declaration that it must mean twenty-four hours in Genesis or the interpretation of Scripture is hopeless? Many eminent scholars see no difficulty in giving to the word "day" in Genesis a period of indefinite duration, probably running into millions of years.*

5. It is also claimed that the Bible account of the making of the sun on the fourth day is unscientific, since light is represented as antedating the sun, but, according to the nebular hypothesis, this is just what must have taken place. A gaseous substance may become too highly heated to be luminous. The great original nebulous mass is supposed to have been in just that condition. After one ring after another of partially condensed material had been thrown off, the central mass, that now constitutes our sun, was probably too highly heated to be luminous, but the cosmical vapors or rings thrown off would cool faster than the central mass and hence become luminous before the sun, and the earth, being small, might well have cooled sufficiently to become solid and receive its light from other masses thrown off that had cooled sufficiently to become luminous. Venus, being younger than the earth, might have been one of the earth's luminaries before the sun became luminous, or there might have been patches of luminous vapor that have since been attracted to the existing planets.

* For a very lucid presentation of this question, see Geikie's "Hours with the Bible," Vol. I., chapter iv.

But there is another explanation that deserves notice. When the earth was in a much more highly heated condition than at present, the atmosphere surrounding would be filled with clouds which would obscure the sun, even if it had cooled sufficiently to become luminous. Then, if on the fourth day the clouds that obscured the sun had been precipitated upon the earth in the form of rain, the sun and moon would become visible and act as the rulers of day and night. It is not said, remarks Geikie, that the sun was created on the fourth day, but only that with the moon and stars it was then appointed to rule the day and night. Is it not a significant fact that the Bible account of the appearance of the sun and moon on the fourth day falls into line with the occurrence of events as explained by the nebular hypothesis, the most widely accepted scientific theory of the present time? And even if its rival hypothesis should finally gain the ascendency, it is hard to see that any necessary conflict would result.

6. Note, then, the order of the Bible account and the testimony of science:

(1) First day: Creation, but no life. On this point science has nothing to say further than that a dead world antedated a world teeming with life. The Bible declares that light appeared on this day, and the nebular hypothesis offers an explanation of this fact.

(2) Second day: Division of the waters under the firmament from the waters above the firmament. This is a declaration of a fact that lies outside of the assured results of science, and hence there is no contradiction. Science does not speak on this point further than by an inference growing out of the nebular hypothesis, and this inference falls in line with the

Bible account. It is probable that at one time the surface of the earth was entirely covered by water, and that by upheavals caused by inward forces the water was gathered into seas and oceans and the continents and islands were lifted up.

(3) Third day: Separation of water into seas and appearance of dry land, followed by vegetable life on land. Science does not contradict this, but claims that vegetable sea life came first. Let it be so; there is no conflict here. The Bible simply gives an account of the appearance of vegetable life on land, being silent as to vegetable life in the water, or, if the word "earth" is taken to mean both land and water, as is probable, then as a matter of course there is no conflict.

(4) Fourth day: Appointing of sun, moon and stars as rulers of day and night. "And God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night. He made the stars also." The word here translated "made" is not the word *bara*, which is used to denote the original act of creation, but *asa*, a word which means to form or construct out of material already in existence. It is used to designate the making of garments, the making of Israel into a great nation, etc. Hence, when God made the sun and moon on the fourth day he simply brought about conditions by which these bodies became rulers of day and night. This may have been done in part by the further shaping and molding of the material forming these bodies, and in part by removing the vapors or dense clouds that surrounded the earth and obscured the heavenly bodies. If the nebular hypothesis is true, it follows that at one time the earth was too highly heated to allow water to remain on its

surface in liquid form. Hence all of the water we now have must have floated above the earth in the form of vapor. In the course of time the vapor would be condensed in part and fall upon the earth. Then the waters which were under the firmament would be divided from the waters above the firmament, according to Bible statement. Finally, so much condensation would have taken place that the heavenly bodies would be visible from the earth, and they would in the meantime have been still further molded and formed by God's plastic hand; that is, by the forces he had set in operation. These processes took place on the fourth day.

These words *bara* and *asa* are used with discrimination when the making of man is described: "And God said, Let us make [*asa*] man." "And God created [*bara*] man in his own image." The word used to describe the making of man's body would properly be *asa*, while the word used to designate the creation of the soul, the immortal part, would necessarily be *bara*, hence both are used in describing the making of man. In speaking of the making of the great sea monsters (Gen. 1:21), the word *bara* is used, which suggests an original act of creation. This, of course, could not be used with strict accuracy in describing the making of the physical part of the monster, if the foregoing position is correct, but since here a new principle is introduced, that of animal life, which before did not exist, *bara* seems entirely in place in this connection. In short, in the first chapter of Genesis *bara* is used three times: in describing the creation of the material universe (that is, the making of matter); the creation of the "sea monster" (that is, the introduction of animal life); the creation of man (that is, the introduc-

tion of spiritual life). It may be thought that the word *bara* should have been used in describing the introduction of vegetable life, and the fact that it is not used in that connection may seem to discredit the above explanation; but the Bible account (Gen. 1:11) simply says: "Let the earth put forth grass and seed." The word used is *dasha,* which means to spring forth, to sprout. There is no reference in the word to any creating or forming act. If the making of the seed containing the germ of life had been described, probably *bara* would have been used, but this, for reasons unknown to us, was omitted. In Gen. 2:3 both words (*bara* and *asa*) are brought together: "And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it because that in it he rested from all his works which God had created [*bara*] and made [*asa*]." This points to the fact that God's work was a double one, that of creating and that of forming or shaping.

(5) Fifth day: Creation of animal life, in the sea and the fowls of the air. This is in perfect harmony with the teachings of science on this point, which declares that sea animals appeared first in the order of creation or development.

(6) Sixth day: Creation of land animals of all kinds, culminating in man, to whom was given dominion because he was the climax of creation, and consequently fitted to hold kingship over all below. Here, again, science and the Bible fall into perfect agreement.

In short, the conflict that some would have us to believe exists, turns out to be more imaginary than real. But we do not insist that the Bible is a scientific book in the sense that its purpose or method is scientific, but we do insist that it is scientific in the sense that the order of events described falls in line with the

"assured facts" of science. One thing more may well be said here. While we claim that Bible statements may be reasonably interpreted in harmony with well-ascertained facts of science, we would not be understood as holding that all of its facts are capable of scientific explanation. Creation itself is a miracle; it is supernatural so far as there is any human grasp of the term "natural," or of that which it implies. By the term "natural" we mean the processes of nature as we see them and know them in their ordinary manifestations. The Bible is full of miracles or supernatural facts. I use the term designedly, because the effort to make the miracles of the Bible a part of the natural as we can know it, or to explain them through the operation of natural laws as we know them, is misleading and I believe pernicious. It is rationalistic in its tendencies, and its logical end is atheism. Many of the facts recorded in the Bible demand the immediate intervention of Deity, and this is the explanation that the Bible freely offers for them.

IV. The manner in which the book was produced.

This need not be dwelt on at any considerable length. Much of the previous matter in this volume has an indirect bearing on this question. Attention is here directed to four points for the sake of emphasis:

1. The Book of Genesis is largely made up of stories taken from the lives of certain prominent characters. The history clusters around Adam, Cain, Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. God's plans and purposes are revealed rather in concrete than in abstract form, which is the method best adapted to the average human mind. Scholars may take more pleasure in the philosophical presentation of a subject,

but the average man delights most in concrete truth, and understands it best. This is one striking peculiarity of the Bible. Its great truths—principles, subjects, methods—are made to walk before us in human form. When God wished to give us the very best conception of himself he did not present abstract notions of the divine attributes and qualities, but clothed himself in human flesh, "and was found in fashion as a man." Jesus Christ did not present a philosophy, but lived a life, and "his life was the light of men." So in the first book of the Bible God's message is presented largely in concrete form in incidents from the lives of great characters, and this method obtains largely throughout the volume.

2. I do not deem it necessary to the integrity of the book to claim that Moses had access to no sources of information from which to draw some of his material. If some of the knowledge, necessary to the carrying out of the divine plan in revelation, was obtainable from human sources, we would expect that Moses would be left to such sources for that part of his message, being divinely guided in the selection of his material. This would be in harmony with the divine method elsewhere shown. God is an economist. He does not call into use superfluous agencies. He does not give truth by direct revelation that is discoverable through the ordinary or natural channels. "Man's extremity is God's opportunity." If men are able to discover the trace of different documents in Genesis, this would in nowise interfere with the Mosaic authorship, as has been previously shown, unless these documents are assigned to a date later than the time of Moses. I think it not improbable that Moses, for a part of his material, drew from existing

documents probably written by different persons at different times previous to that of Moses. It is now a quite well-established fact that the art of writing is much older than the time of Moses. Moses probably acted in part as a compiler under the divine guidance. He need not slavishly follow the documents to which he had access. He could expound, curtail, complete, adorn and make the production his own, just as any other historian might do, being guided from error and mistake by inspiration.

3. I hold it to be very important in dealing with the method of production to take into account the factor of inspiration. It is not practicable or necessary to enter upon a discussion of the question of inspiration at this point; suffice it to say, the Bible seems to recognize at least two general forms of inspiration—verbal and thought. In the former the exact words are imparted to the agent, of which we have some examples. In the latter the thought is communicated to the agent, leaving him free to express it in his own style. The thought is imparted through vision, supernatural dream, miraculous spiritual illumination, stimulation of memory to recall things that would have been otherwise lost, and possibly in other ways.

Moses must have received much of his material by direct inspiration, as its nature shows, but as to just how much he may have been divinely guided to select from existing materials, or from tradition, we can not know. Certain it is that the age of the patriarchs was favorable to the handing down of history in traditional form. After all is said, it is evident that inspiration played a prominent part in the method of production. In short, the writing can only be properly

viewed and appreciated when considered as divinely inspired.

4. It is not improbable that Moses' work may have been supplemented to a slight degree by some later author, but not to the extent of in any way interfering with the integrity of the work. A comment or a notice here and there may have been inserted. Ezra's hand may have had something to do in the final shaping up of the writings. All this may be accepted without in any way lessening our faith in the book as a divine revelation.

V. The divisions of the book.

The Book of Genesis very naturally falls into five divisions, each one setting forth one great central person.

1. The first eleven chapters give us an outline history of the world up to the time of Abraham. Adam is the central figure. This portion of the book is made up of stories pertaining to the creation, the fall, Cain and Abel, the flood, and the story of the building of the tower of Babel, together with some genealogies and the table of nations. It is preparatory to the history of Israel as a nation, and furnishes the background for the development and segregation of the chosen people.

2. Beginning with chapter 12, Abraham, the father of the chosen nation, comes into view, and he occupies the center of the stage up to and including chapter 20.

3. Chapter 21 continues the history of Abraham, and introduces his son Isaac, with whom the history is more or less occupied till chapter 26 is ended.

4. In chapter 27 Jacob comes to the front, and be-

comes the central figure in the history and holds the attention to the close of chapter 35.

5. Passing over chapter 36, which is genealogical in character, chapter 37 introduces Joseph as the important and interesting figure, who occupies the attention to the close of the book.

In brief, we may say Genesis gives us the early history of the world and a history of the fathers of the chosen nation.

6. Interesting characters are incidentally brought to view; such as Noah; Lot, the brother of Abraham; Sarah, the wife of Abraham; Rebeckah, the wife of Isaac; Esau, the brother of Jacob, and some others of less prominence. All of them contribute striking features that will never lose their interest till the end of time.

7. Predictive prophecy is introduced here and there, but it is far less abundant than it is later in the history of the chosen people. The promise to Eve that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent is regarded as the first prophetic utterance. As a counterpart of this may be mentioned the great spiritual promise to Abraham that in him and in his seed all families of the earth should be blessed, accompanied by the promise of a country and a temporal posterity. Here is really the very heart of the Book of Genesis, and on these two promises to Abraham rest the two great covenants known as the old and the new. In this book is shown the beginning of God's great scheme of grace embracing the whole human family. Thence onward, in ever-increasing measures of strength and power, the great plan marches onward to its fulfillment, and to-day more than ever before the

signs of the times indicate that the blessed consummation will not be long delayed.

VI. The design of the book.

It would be hard to set forth in a sentence the great central design of the book, but several distinct purposes seem to stand out with more or less clearness:

1. The great question of man's origin is distinctly stated. He is the child of the King of the universe, created by Him in his own image and likeness. No more ennobling or inspiring thought is conceivable.

2. Man's disobedience, brought about through the machinations of an external malevolent agent. This fact gives hope of final victory, since sin did not spring up in man spontaneously and is hence not native to the soul. It is an intruder and may be cast out.

3. The largest general purpose of the book may be stated as the history of the development of an elect people through whom should come the redemption of the race, and as the setting forth of God's relations and dealings with that people until they were sufficiently developed to be molded into a great independent nation.

4. Some of the great lessons taught, whether incidentally or by design it matters not, may be enumerated as follows:

(1) The destructive tendencies of sin as witnessed in the character and fate of Cain and his descendants, the disastrous effects culminating in the destruction of an ungodly world.

(2) The saving effects of righteousness as shown in the line of Seth, Enoch, Noah, Abraham and onward.

(3) The power and blessedness of faith as demonstrated in the life of Abraham, a faith capable of withstanding the greatest conceivable test, as is shown in the offering up of Isaac.

(4) The transformation of Jacob from a scheming, dishonest man into one that God could trust and use in the carrying out of his great purposes.

(5) The reason for the loss of great privileges or birthright; namely, the despising or neglect of those privileges as shown in the history of Esau.

(6) The true meaning of repentance as exemplified in the case of Jacob in his notable wrestle with the angel.

(7) The elevation of Joseph, not for his own sake, but for the sake of service to Egypt and to his own people.

These are a few of the many wonderful lessons taught in this very wonderful book.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Book of Exodus.

The Book of Exodus is, as its name indicates, the book of the going out. It gives an account of the preparation of Israel for deliverance from Egyptian bondage, the accomplishment of that deliverance, and the establishment of the theocracy by the promulgation of the law from Sinai by the hand of Moses, which constituted the national charter.

I. The character of the book is worthy of consideration.

1. It has every mark of authentic history. It may well have been written by an eye-witness, judging from the evident familiarity of the writer with local conditions, his lucid and graphic descriptions, his intimate and accurate knowledge of events which is incidentally and undesignedly shown at every point, and the complete agreement of statement with all geographical, ethnological and historical facts gathered from outside sources.

2. It has a high moral character. It exalts righteousness and condemns vice. It is always dignified in its tone and never descends to the trivial and inconsequential. Its writer speaks forth evidently what he believes to be the words of truth and soberness. He moves on an exalted plane, in conscious fellowship with the Jehovah he worships and obeys. If signs and wonders are introduced, it is done without hesi-

tancy or apology, or the slightest shadow of doubt or uncertainty. The rule of Horace is exemplified: When a God is introduced there is always an occasion or a difficulty worthy of a God's intervention present. Men may deny the facts recorded, but the signs of insincerity or falsehood are conspicuously absent from the writing.

3. Its credibility goes without saying with those who have no prejudice against the miraculous. To those of a rationalistic turn of mind many of its statements will be rejected, but this is equally true of all the miracles recorded in both Old and New Testaments. The reverent student of God's word will find nothing here that he can not accept. The miracles recorded are certainly not too great for God, nor do they in their character impeach his moral excellence, his wisdom or his goodness. Many of its historic facts have been vigorously assailed, but without effect up to the present time, and all recent investigations have tended to support its statements. Many allusions in ancient profane history point to a connection between Israel and Egypt. Manetho, it is said, speaks of a foreign dynasty. This agrees with the Bible writer who mentions "a king who knew not Joseph." He also speaks of an eastern people occupying lower eastern Egypt, and says they became numerous, thus corroborating the Bible account that represents them as three million strong at the time of the exodus, if each fighting man represents five persons, which is the generally allowed proportion. All of the Pharaohs have been exhumed from their ancient and long-forgotten tombs except the Pharaoh of the exodus. Was his body lost in the Red Sea when he pursued fleeing Israel? At least, the missing body is suggestive, although the ac-

count does not specifically state that he was lost with his army.

All in all, the believer in God's word has no cause to surrender his faith in the Book of Exodus, but, on the contrary, there is much to strengthen it.

II. The divisions of the book are by no means obscure.

Two distinct schemes of division may be readily applied to the Book of Exodus: One based upon the character of the subject-matter and the other upon the dominant thoughts in the different portions. The former yields a twofold, the latter a threefold, division.

1. The twofold division consists of:

(1) A historical portion, occupying the first eighteen chapters, the ground covered being an account of the preparation leading to the deliverance of Israel and the actual accomplishment of that deliverance.

(2) A legislative portion, beginning with chapter 19 and occupying the remaining portion of the book. The complicated details of the peculiar religious economy of the chosen people are set forth and a description of the tabernacle and a history of its construction are given.

2. The threefold division, based on the leading thought of the different sections in which we have the first division of the previous analysis subdivided, is as follows:

(1) The first eleven chapters deal with a threefold preparation, all leading to, and necessary to, the accomplishment of the one great result:*

(*a*) There is first the preparation of Moses for the work of deliverance. His birth, his Egyptian life of

*"Studies of the Books of the Bible," Stevenson, pp. 18-21.

forty years, and his Arabian experience of forty years, absorb the attention of the historian, until he receives his commission at the burning bush and miraculous power is conferred upon him fitting him for the task.

(*b*) The second preparation is that of the people to be delivered. This was accomplished by reciting all that God had spoken to Moses and performing the signs in their sight. Thus faith in the leader was produced. Here we find a close analogy between Moses and his great antitype. As Moses demonstrated his divine call and mission, so Christ wrought miracles to substantiate his claims. Hence the words of John: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples that are not written in this book, but these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and believing have life in his name."

(*c*) It was necessary for Pharaoh to be prepared to let the people go hence, the next step in the process of deliverance. A description of this preparation begins with chapter 5 and ends with chapter 11, or, rather, with the slaying of the firstborn of the Egyptians in the first part of chapter 12.

Now all things are ready for the deliverance of God's people. The leader is prepared, the people are prepared, and Pharaoh is prepared. When God undertakes to do things, he moves forward by logical, necessary and irresistible steps. It is evident that preparation is the leading thought in this division.

(2) With chapter 12 the history of the actual deliverance begins, and this occupies the attention of the historian up to and including chapter 18. The passage through the sea, the song of deliverance, several stations or encampments, the giving of the manna, the

appointing of the Sabbath, and the visit of Jethro, are graphically set forth.

In this section the salvation of Israel is the dominant idea.

(3) Beginning with chapter 19, the steps are set forth necessary for the habitation of God with his people. A great national assembly, with a constitution consisting of the ten commandments, is formed, and much other legislation extremely minute and particular. The final culmination is reached in the erection of the tabernacle and the filling of that wonderful typical building with the glory of the Lord, symbolic of his presence in his church, the great antitype of the tabernacle, yea, even of his presence through the Holy Spirit in the individual Christian heart, which in the last analysis is the temple of the living God. In this section habitation or dwelling-place of God with his people is the central idea.

III. In this book three great designs are readily discoverable.

1. There is first of all the evident purpose to preserve the memorial of the great facts of the selection, development and consecration of the chosen people. This is done by setting forth three stages of national history; namely, the nation enslaved, the nation redeemed, and the nation set apart and consecrated to the service of God by a peculiar blending of its political and religious life.

2. The book also serves a great moral purpose. Paul says: "All these things happened to them for examples." In other words, the history furnishes us with a series of impressive types foreshadowing the spiritual verities of the future universal kingdom of heaven for which God was preparing.

(1) The chosen nation was typical of the elect people in Christ Jesus, which was an election of grace conditioned on man's acceptance and conformity in life to the divine standards.

(2) Moses, the emancipator of his people from the bondage of Egypt and their leader through the wilderness into the promised land, was typical of Christ as the emancipator of Christians from the bondage of sin and their leader through the pilgrimage of life to the land of everlasting life.

(3) The passover lamb, slain on the eve of the departure from Egypt, through whose blood, sprinkled upon the doorposts, the people were saved from the destroying angel that passed through the land, was typical of Christ, the true passover slain for us, through whose blood we are saved from the death due to sin.

(4) The passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, by which they were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and thus saved from the Egyptians and constituted a separate nation, was typical of our baptism into Christ, by which we are saved from sin and become an elect or chosen people set apart unto good works.

(5) The giving of the law from Sinai, fifty days after the slaying of the first passover, was typical of the giving of the Christian law which was promulgated on the first Pentecost after the slaying of the true passover.

(6) The Tabernacle, with its Outer Court, Holy Place, Holy of Holies, together with the furniture of each division, was typical of the new institution, its ordinances and appointments of grace and glory.

(7) Finally, the passage over Jordan into the promised land was typical of the passage of the Chris-

tian over the Jordan of death into the Canaan of everlasting rest.

3. The larger design, and in a sense embracing the other two, seems to be to show the relation of Israel to Jehovah as embraced in both his direct and indirect purposes, or, rather in his immediate and remote plans. We thus not only see God's dealings with his people in liberating them and molding them for himself, but large expectation is awakened as to the gracious plans and purposes of God for all mankind.

IV. It may not be without profit to consider briefly the relations of Exodus to the book that precedes it.

1. In historic matter there is a wide chasm. Genesis closes with the death of Jacob and Joseph; both events are recorded in the last chapter of the book Exodus opens by giving a brief statement concerning the rapid growth of the Israelites in numbers, the jealousy thus aroused in the Egyptians and the consequent oppression, and then records the birth of Moses, which is the real beginning of the book. Between the death of Jacob and this event a long time intervened, estimated at two hundred years or more. In harmony with the divine method in revelation, everything not germane to the divine purpose is dropped out no matter how interesting it might have been in itself. Imagination can readily supply missing details of the lives of the Israelites during this long period. At first they no doubt lived a free, easy, prosperous life, pastoral in its nature, but gradually the hand of the oppressor became heavier, and labor increased until life itself became a burden.

2. Between the subject-matter of Genesis and that of Exodus there is an interesting contrast. Each book sets forth in its beginning a new and distinct creation.

Genesis tells us how God formed the material universe. Exodus tells us how God formed a nation, and both, as Matthew Henry remarks, to his own praise and glory. In one, the same author says, we have the creation of the world in history; in the other, the redemption of the world in type.

In the first we have the promise made to Abraham as to a fleshly posterity; in the latter we have the accomplishment of that promise. In short, in Exodus we see the second step in God's majestic progress toward the accomplishment of his stupendous plan for the salvation of the race.

V. Some of the prominent doctrines of the book may be enumerated as follows:

1. Deliverance accomplished through the operation of a higher power. This is universally true. As Mr. Drummond says, the upper world must reach down to the lower and lift it up. The mineral is lifted up by the vegetable, the vegetable by the animal, the human by the divine. The lifting force must be above the level of the thing lifted, hence, for any man to become a lifter of his fellows, he must himself be lifted above them.

2. The necessity of ordinances for the purpose of impressing religious truth. Let no man think the ordinances of God can be set aside without disastrous results. Does not this show that forms have a value if kept within proper limits?

3. Vicarious sacrifice for the salvation of men or the suffering of the innocent for the guilty. The innocent paschal lamb was slain for a sinful people, thus pointing to Him who suffered for us and bore in his own body our sins upon the tree. This supreme example points to a universal fact. The cross is the

great lifting force of the universe, and he who escapes it deprives himself of the power to save others.

4. Reconciliation with God accomplished through divinely appointed means. The chasm between God and man is not of God's making. "Our sins have separated between us and God," but, thanks be to his name, the chasm has been bridged from the divine side to the human. Hence, the apostle says, "We pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." If the chasm remains, it is our fault. If man remains unreconciled, he alone is to blame.

5. The necessity for great leadership. Power, to be effective, must be rightly directed, and proper direction demands leadership. All can not be leaders. For one leader there must be a multitude of good followers, but he who would render supreme service must prepare himself for leadership. Then, if he has the inherent authority, in God's good time he will come into his kingdom.

6. Approach to God through a Mediator. Moses was the mediator between God and Israel, and in this he was typical of Christ, our Mediator through whom we have access to the Father.

7. God as the great necessity in civil government. There is much said about the separation of church and state, and this is one of the cardinal principles of our government, but let no one imagine that this means the elimination of God from the state. The fact is, the institution from which God is eliminated is doomed to perish. What the governments of the world need to-day is more of God, and the way to have more of God in our government is to have more of God in the people. The habitation of God with men is the great necessity for ideal government.

CHAPTER XIX.

The Book of Leviticus.

If we have been impressed by the sacred character of the two books that we have considered, we will certainly be even more so by the study of this book. Here God is brought very close to his people in that he gives directions concerning the minutest details of their daily lives. The tendency of this is to make even the every-day routine of existence very sacred.

I. There are some peculiarities of the book that arrest attention and may well be noticed.

1. The previous books are full of historic incidents, but in this book historic matter almost reaches the vanishing point. Three incidents make up the historic matter of the book, except that the giving of different bodies of laws may be regarded as historic incidents. In chapter 8 we have an account of the consecration of the priests; in chapter 10 the punishment of Nadab and Abihu, for offering strange fire on the altar, is recorded, and in chapter 20 the official punishment of one for blasphemy is mentioned. With these exceptions, the whole book is given up to the recording of laws and descriptions of the observance of laws.

But while the book deals little in historic incident, yet it shows a historic progress in the legislation delivered by God to his people. There is a marked

advance upon the previous legislation, the new laws being supplementary to and closely connected with those of Exodus.

2. There is a notable lack of anything like systematic arrangement, which is doubtless accounted for by the conditions and circumstances under which the laws were given. If the laws were given at different times during the sojourn at Sinai, as is probable, the fragmentary nature of the laws is just what might be expected. In fact, a logically and systematically arranged code would give rise to grave doubts as to its genuineness. If this legislation had been forged by a person or persons hundreds of years after Moses' time, systematic arrangement would doubtless have characterized it, and the absence of this is a strong proof for the claim of Mosaic authorship.

3. There is a harmony of spirit and detail which, taken in connection with the fragmentary or unsystematic character of the book, argues strongly for unity of authorship and the inspiration of the writer. In such a book the harmony that exists could scarcely have been produced through a plurality of authors.

II. The divisions of the book come next in order.

The book may be divided and subdivided at great length, owing to the multitude of details covered by the legislation; but the design of this volume does not require this at our hands. Three broad divisions may be made. We have:

1. The portion occupied with the opening chapters, 1 to 7.

The sacrifices may be divided as follows:

(1) As to kind, into bloody and unbloody; (2) as to aim, into sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, peace-

offerings; (3) as to manner, voluntary and required; (4) as to offerings prescribed for times and seasons, which are minutely described and specifically enjoined.

This, however, is rather a classification of some of the materials of the book than a division of the book.

2. The second division, beginning with chapter 8, deals with the question of priesthood. An account is given of how Aaron and his sons were set apart to the holy office by solemn and impressive ceremonies. Directions to the sons of Aaron are given, beasts are separated into clean and unclean, directions concerning the dealing with diseases follow, and this in turn by instructions concerning sacrifice.

3. From chapter 17 onward the great absorbing theme is holiness unto the Lord: Purity, honesty, chastity, hospitality, ceremonial cleanliness, faithfulness, are enjoined and emphasized.

Beginning with chapter 23 the great national festivals are set forth; namely, the Passover, Pentecost and Feast of Tabernacles.

Chapter 25 deals with sabbatical years and jubilees, giving instruction as to the rest of the land, reversal of property to original owners, manner of dealing with bondmen and their redemption. The closing chapters deal with commands, promises, threatenings, vows and offerings of divers kinds. In short, in the third section practical religious life is made prominent. In reading this portion of the book one familiar with the New Testament is reminded of the words of James: "Pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and the widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

III. The design of the book is evident.

1. In Exodus there are two great themes: Israel redeemed, and God descending to meet and dwell with his people. In Leviticus the people are instructed how they may draw near to God with acceptance, and how they may retain his favor and blessing.

2. The connection with Exodus is very close. That book closes with the setting up of the Tabernacle, made after the pattern shown to Moses in the mount. This was the great meeting-house or place of worship located at different places during the period of wandering and conquest, but finally fixed at Jerusalem, when the Tabernacle, a temporary structure, gave place to a permanent structure called the Temple, but constructed after the same general plan as the Tabernacle. It will thus be seen that Leviticus follows Exodus naturally and necessarily. Both must be taken together in order to have an adequate and proper conception of the divine plan. The Book of Exodus thus makes the design of Leviticus very clear.

3. The great prophetic purpose should not be lost sight of. As the Tabernacle was made after a divinely given model, so it was fitting that the worship which should there be administered should be divinely prescribed, and this was the more necessary owing to the typical nature of both building and worship. God alone could plan a house and a worship that would furnish a pictorial outline of the great Spiritual Temple, and its worship and ordinances, which were yet fifteen hundred years in the future when the Tabernacle and its worship were ordained.

How any one can place the new institution and the old side by side; note how each matches the other, part to part; how, as has been said, "in the old the new

lies concealed, and in the new the old is revealed," and then doubt the divine origin of either, passes comprehension.

When the typical nature of the old institution is considered, we see the significance of God's language to Moses: "See that thou make all things according to the pattern shown thee in the mount." There was no room left for Moses to exercise his own ingenuity or smartness. He could not look down the centuries fifteen hundred years and see the institution that was finally to displace the one he was then engaged in setting up, and make each part of his institution a complete pictorial representation of that which was to follow. Only He who inhabits eternity could do that.

4. Under this head a matter of practical moment to us should not escape our observation. Since the law of Moses had an ideal tendency and purpose; since it looked to the future as well as to its own present; since all of its sacrifices were typical—we may well ask, How does this affect us? Are we likely to fail of a proper understanding of the new institution under which we live, by an inadequate or wrong conception of the old? To ask these questions is to answer them. We study mythology in order to understand many allusions in classic literature. Much more should we study the modes of Jewish worship in order to understand the Bible literature both of the Old and New Testaments. In fact, I do not believe we can have a comprehensive view of the religion of Christ if we leave out of view the typical preparatory religion that preceded it.

5. Among the various designs discoverable in both Exodus and Leviticus there is none more important

than the typical presentation of Christ. As Moses typified Christ as the great prophet and teacher of the new dispensation, so Aaron typified him as our great High Priest. As Aaron offered the prescribed sin-offering, so Christ offered himself as a sin-offering for the world. As Aaron went into the Holy of Holies with the blood of atonement and sprinkled it on the mercy-seat, so Christ entered heaven with his own blood, and sent forth the Holy Spirit as a witness of the fact that his offering had been accepted.

IV. The credibility of the book is substantiated by conclusive evidences.

1. There is constant reference to the Tabernacle, and to no other place of worship. If there was ever any departure from this rule in later history, it grew out of extraordinary conditions that made such deviation necessary or readily explainable. During the wilderness march the Tabernacle occupies a central and conspicuous position.

2. All the incidents recorded are associated with camp life, and Moses was the commander of the camp. The whole atmosphere is just what it ought to be under the circumstances set forth. Could a later writer have transplanted himself backward for hundreds of years, and have maintained such uniform consistency of statement amidst the multitude of details introduced? Such a thing is incredible. "If thy faith be weak, why choose the harder part?"

3. The laws fit the Mosaic period, and would need modification to suit a later time. If in the legislation future conditions are ever anticipated, is it not much more rational to account for this on the ground of the inspiration of the writer for a wise purpose in the

providence of God, than to put forth the theory that a writer at a much later date had invented legislation to meet conditions that had long since disappeared? The former is just what might be expected under all the circumstances, while the latter is inconceivable, or, rather, unreasonable in the highest degree.

4. There is much to remind one of Egypt. There is just a sufficient tinge of Egyptian life, manners and customs to harmonize with the claim that the writer had been educated in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. These incidental matters tend to strengthen faith in the credibility of the writings in no small degree.

V. A few of the great lessons of the book are here set forth.

1. There is a striking difference between the old economy and the new in the way life and conduct are regulated. In the former, law is the governing principle. Conduct is regulated by, "Thou shalt "and "Thou shalt not." Much is prescribed. Actions are minutely specified. The individual is kept in the divinely appointed path by positive and negative rules. In the latter the laws and specifications are conspicuously few. Worship is simple and largely voluntary. Principles are planted in the heart and men are governed from the inside out. Paul speaks of the new law being written on fleshly tables of the heart and not on tables of stone. This is the ideal way. No man is safe until he is governed on the high ground of principle. This is the system under which God was preparing to place the world. Hence, says the apostle, "the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ."

2. It may well be observed, however, that government by law is a necessary stage in the process of

development, both in the individual and society at large. The little child must of necessity be largely governed by law. There is a time when "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not" are his rules of action. This, however, is transient. If the process is faithfully adhered to during the proper time, after awhile the individual is lifted up to a plane where he acts from principle. He does things because they are right and not because the father says "Thou shalt" or "Thou shalt not." To omit this stage in the development of the child, as many parents do, is disastrous. A person must learn to act upon authority if he is afterward to be trusted to act on principle. God teaches us this great lesson in his dealing with Israel. He put the infant undisciplined and undeveloped nation under law, rigid and severe. He recognized the fact that individuals and nations psychologically demand the same thing; children must be put under law. Is it not, however, a deplorable sight to see people under the new dispensation insisting that they be kept under law; demanding that a law or rule must be given for every little detail of Christian life, worship or work; refusing to move on the high ground of principle. To do this is to insist on living under Moses instead of under Christ. However, if people come into the church of Christ, and continue to be children, never able to come unto a knowledge of the truth, then by all means let them remain slaves to the letter, for this is far better than license, or liberty without law, but the ideal thing is to be made free from the law in the sense of being able to do right because it is right and not simply because it is written.

By this, I would not be understood as intimating that there are no commands under the new dispensa-

tion, but they are few and simple. Such as are given must be obeyed, but the multitudinous duties of Christian life, and many things that may enter into Christian worship, are left to be performed through the operation of inward principles implanted in the soul through the teaching of Christ and his apostles. No more would I intimate that Judaism was wholly a system of law. It had spiritual elements, and it implanted the beginnings of spiritual activities. Just as the father, while governing the child by law, begins the inculcating of principles that shall ultimately dominate life, so God dealt with Israel.

One other reason remains for so much detail in legal enactment under the old dispensation; namely, its highly typical character. This feature of the system made much specific command and instruction a necessity.

3. Another lesson of the book is this: Without holiness no man shall see the Lord. The great practical purpose of the system for the people to whom it was given was to purify life, build character, fit men for service, and thus prepare them for fellowship with God. The pure in heart only can see God.

4. A study of the wonderful book should teach us the lesson of gratitude to God for our precious inheritance. At best the burdensome and complicated system under which the Israelites were placed was only prospective so far as the pardon it offered was concerned. The blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sin. Condemnation was only stayed from year to year; but how different with us. "There is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

Well may we sing:

"Free from the law, oh happy condition!
Jesus has died and there is remission.
Cursed by the law and bruised by the fall,
Jesus has saved us once for all."

Paul declared: "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Under Moses sins were remembered again every year, but under Christ our sins and iniquities are remembered no more.

5. The last lesson that I will cite is found in the principle: "Unto whom much is given of them much shall be required." While we may well rejoice in our inestimable privileges, let us never forget that thereby our own obligations are greatly increased. Well may we pray for divine strength to enable us to meet and discharge our great obligations, that we may stand justified at last and receive the approval of our King.

CHAPTER XX.

The Book of Numbers.

The purpose of the sacred writer sometimes plays havoc with chronological order and relative proportion between different sections of the subject-matter. God does not always inspire his agents to record events in chronological order or to occupy space according to the time covered by the history. God's revelations are for a definite purpose, and he marches to the desired end in his own way, which is often very different from the way that men would choose. Hence, it is not uncommon to hear men criticize the divine method of procedure and to demand why more has not been said here and less there. The Bible method of presenting the truth is unique in many respects, and stamps it as a book *sui generis*.

I. The Book of Numbers furnishes an instance of a Bible peculiarity in respect to order and proportion.*

1. We have first an example of chronological displacement. The first chapters of the book record the events of the second month of the second year after the departure from Egypt, while subsequent chapters record the events of the first month of the year. This departure from chronological sequence of events is clearly shown in the history of the two months.

* "Studies of the Books of the Bible," Stevenson, p. 26.

The important thing with the writer was not to present a string of events as they occurred, but to bring to view a situation that could best be shown in this way. The second thing in order of time should sometimes be first in order of narration, in order to secure a certain result. It is so here. The great purpose of the book is first thrust into view as we shall soon see, and this is accomplished by narrating the events of the second month first.

2. We have in this book an example of chronological disproportion. It is a habit of sacred writers to condense unimportant and irrelevant matters into very small space. In this book ten chapters are occupied with the events of two months, nine chapters with the events of thirty-eight years, and seventeen chapters with the events of but a brief time at most. How true is this to life as we know it. There are days and days. There are seasons that seem to contain nothing of importance, that are filled up with the most commonplace events, and then brief spaces of time, a moment, an hour, a day, into which the whole future life seems to be condensed and to which the whole past life seems to have led. After all, it is not the length of time that counts, but the intensity of the moment or the hour; which is another way of saying, it is not the quantity of work, but the quality, that achieves the results. This means, get ready for service if you would serve with distinction and effectiveness. This means, keep your eyes open for the decisive moment. "Watch, therefore, for in an hour that ye think not, the Son of man cometh." They that were ready went into the marriage feast. The prepared man is the secret of success.

II. The Book of Numbers occupies a logical place in the history of Israel.

1. Mere historical narration does not explain this book.

The facts in themselves are comparatively unimportant. It is the purpose back of the facts that has significance. It was pointed out that the two great promises made to Abraham, and repeated to Isaac and Jacob, constitute the very heart of Genesis. The first promise related to a seed and a country. Genesis gives an account of the development of the seed or chosen people. Exodus recounts their redemption. Leviticus tells of their sanctification through the peculiar civil and religious institutions appointed, but the history can not stop at this point. A great expectation has been awakened which must be met and satisfied.

2. The real purpose of the Book of Numbers is now manifest. The first part of the first promise to Abraham has been fulfilled. A nation has been created, redeemed and sanctified. The promised land must now be provided as the next necessary step in the accomplishment of the great purpose, and in the fulfillment of the great promise, but this means conquest. The promised land is occupied by powerful and warlike peoples who must be driven out. War is inevitable, and an organized army is the immediate pressing necessity. The Book of Numbers is the historic account given by an eye-witness of the organization and training of the army of Jehovah for the conquest of the country promised to Abraham and his seed.

3. Incidentally in the connection we may well pause to notice a wonderful spectacle.

Jehovah is calling the very people for whom the promise was made to assist him in the carrying out of that promise, as if the arm of Jehovah must needs be supplemented with the puny arm of man. But this is just what God in his wisdom has done. He has called man to be a colaborer with him in the carrying out of his great purposes. Is it not a thrilling spectacle to see Jehovah in the midst of a drilled, organized army of men, commanding them through his great chosen general and leading them to the conquest of the country divinely chosen for their habitation? Two questions are here suggested:

(1) Was all this for Israel's sake, or did God love Israel better than he loved the nations which were doomed to destruction? Is it not clear that God chose Israel and made it the recipient of great blessings that they might be his instruments of blessing to all mankind? God is no respecter of persons, but he chooses one man and confers upon him peculiar favors for the sake of all men. Election for service is a great doctrine of Scripture.

(2) Has this peculiar and striking spectacle any practical bearing on us? Does it not point to the fact that the church of the living God is his great army commanded and led by the great Captain, Jesus Christ, whose mission is the conquest of the world? Let us know that the church is God's army, called out from the world, redeemed by the blood of Christ, and sanctified by the Holy Spirit for a great purpose that is world-wide in its scope and godlike in its character.

III. The results achieved by the wilderness experience.

1. The first section of the book comprises the first nine chapters and gives us the history that transpired

around Sinai. Organization, military discipline, preparation, are the burden of this section. A year was consumed in this process.

2. Chapter 10 introduces the history of the wilderness march.

Sinai, associated with so many wonderful events and experiences, must now be left behind. New lessons must now be learned, new experiences encountered and new disciplinary processes endured. Surely, we say, an army under a great commander selected by Jehovah can not fail. Surely its march will be triumphant and its ultimate victory sure; surely nothing can withstand the omnipotence of God. Alas! the contrary is true. God's progress can be hindered, his plans can be, temporarily at least, thwarted, by man, strange to say. God's plans are in part wrought out through human agency, and the result depends upon the efficiency of the agent. If one man or one people fail, God will doubtless find another, but in the meantime the working out of the divine purpose is checked; the progress of the world toward its ultimate high destiny is hindered. Paul understood this when he said: "I suffer all things lest I should hinder the gospel of Christ." In the history of Israel we see some of the ways in which the divinely appointed work may be held back. We notice that their progress was checked by:

(1) The murmuring of the people. They complained, were dissatisfied. Doubtless they exalted their own opinions against the wisdom of Jehovah, a by no means uncommon action with men in every age. As a result, punishment must follow and God's work is retarded.

(2) The people lusted after the fleshpots of Egypt. They faced backward with yearning eyes and hungry

hearts. The great promised blessings of the future were crowded out of sight, by the recollection of things past and by their present experiences. There is no progress except when the eye is fixed firmly on the goal and the face is set squarely toward the future prize. Man must be drawn forward by hope, and hope is a combination of expectation and desire.

(3) Jealousy came in to play its ever diabolical part. When jealousy and envy are present, the devil always levies a heavy tax or demands a large contribution, and Miriam and Aaron, great as they both were, allowed jealousy to enter their hearts. They said: "Hath the Lord indeed spoken only with Moses? Hath he not spoken also with us?" This shows that otherwise great people may have some very weak spots in their nature. Alas for Moses! The last thing to be expected happened to him. Those nearest to him, of his own flesh and blood, through the operation of the Satanic principle of envy and jealousy turned against him, and so again the progress was hindered. That punishment followed is no great consolation, yet it was a merciful divine judgment. Were it not for the punishment connected with sin, the world would plunge to its destruction.

(4) Cowardice comes in to complete the dire calamity. Twelve men were sent to spy out the land; two only were brave men and made a favorable report; ten were craven souls who trembled in the presence of difficulties and dangers. The people followed the majority, which is ever the rule, and reaped the reward of their folly. This shows that it is always dangerous to intrust important affairs to men of inferior mold.

One thing after another intervened to hinder the speedy accomplishment of the divine purpose. God's

splendidly organized and drilled army is defeated before it ever faces the enemy. It is turned back to perish in the wilderness. What else could be done? Only this, that from these miserable, complaining, lusting, cowardly creatures whom God had exalted by choosing as his people shall finally grow up a mighty host worthy to take part in the accomplishment of God's plan. So it must ever be. If one agent fails, God will find another; if one people fail, God will raise up another. Only let us know this: in the end God's purposes shall not fail of accomplishment. Now come long years of history condensed into small space. All the experiences of this fearful period it matters little for us to know. Destruction and development are the two keywords that tell us much that was not recorded—the destruction of the incompetent, the inefficient, the useless, and the development of an agent that God could use to his own praise and glory.

Do we see any analogy here to the history of the church? Alas! how often has that great host of the spiritual Israel, that should be "fair as the moon, bright as the sun and terrible as an army with banners," been thwarted in its purpose and held back in its progress by murmurings, jealousies and lustings of those whom God has called for high and holy service, yea, by the cowardice and faint-heartedness of those who ought to be brave and courageous, strong in their faith in their Leader, who never lost a battle and who has said, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

3. Chapters 20, 21 and 22 show that a new epoch is dawning. Aaron and Miriam pass away. While some of the old faults persist, yet a people has been

developed of more virile quality. They are able to face the enemy successfully. Evidently the time is near when they can cross over to possess the land chosen of God for their habitation, and where they may work out their destiny under God's manifold providences, and accomplish the preparation for the ushering in of the kingdom of grace and glory. Two and a half tribes find permanent habitation on the east of Jordan, but they were required to cross over with their brethren and assist in the subjugation of the land under a new leader.

4. The results of the wilderness march may be summed up in one sentence: The creation of a new people fitted for the carrying out of the divine purpose respecting Israel.

Incidentally the evil effects of a slavery upon its victims are shown. Long years, yea, generations of servitude, had eaten out the manly qualities and sterling virtues necessary for the accomplishment of great things. All God could do was to lead them out into the wilderness and then allow them to perish, but while the process of destruction was going on he could raise up of their children a new people, and develop in them, under the free, stimulating, morally healthful conditions of desert life, the very virtues and manly qualities that slavery had destroyed in their fathers. Strange are the ways of Providence. He overruleth all things to his own glory, and maketh the wrath of man to praise him.

This should give us confidence in the final outcome of God's plans for the redemption of a lost world. Oftentimes the future may look dark and the final issue uncertain, but let us know that no enemy is too strong for God. Whether they are murmurers, lusters

and cowards within, or bitter, relentless foes without, all opposition will finally come to naught. Israel had to contend against internal and external foes of the direst kind, yet finally, through God's good providence, she came into possession of her promised inheritance.

IV. A brief summary of contents is here submitted arranged with reference to the three distinct sections of the book.

1. In the first section (chapters 1-10) we have the events of the first year:

(1) Preparation for departure from Sinai—numbering and arrangement of the army.

(2) Assignment of the duties of the Levites.

(3) The giving of a body of additional laws. These embrace leprosy, trespass, adultery, and the Nazarite vow.

(4) The offering of the princes, at the dedication of the altar.

(5) The consecration of the Levites.

(6) The keeping of the second passover—the first after leaving Egypt.

(7) The march upon Canaan.

2. In Section 2 (chapters 11-19) we have the events of the next thirty-eight years:

(1) The murmuring of the people.

(2) The lusting after Egypt.

(3) The jealousy of Miriam and Aaron.

(4) The searching out of the spies.

(5) The cowardice of the people displayed when the spies gave their report.

(6) Condemnation of the people to death.

(7) Brief history of the long wilderness experience, together with notices of the giving of additional laws.

3. In Section 3 (chapters 20-36) we have the events of the fortieth year:

(1) Death of Miriam.

(2) The bringing of water from the rock.

(3) The death of Aaron at Mt. Hor.

(4) The struggles of Israel with the kings of the Amorites and of Bashan, and their successes.

(5) Alarm of the King of Moab—Balaam sent to curse the Israelites.

(6) Renumbering of the people.

(7) Moses sentenced to exclusion from the promised land.

(8) Joshua appointed as Moses' successor.

(9) Recapitulation of the various encampments.

(10) Command to destroy the Canaanites.

(11) Arrangements for dividing the land.

(12) Appointing cities of refuge.

V. The credibility rests on solid grounds.

The divisive hypothesis examined in earlier chapters has proven a failure, as must be apparent to an unbiased mind. The book is doubtless the product of Moses, which statement is strengthened by the following facts:

1. References to Egypt show a knowledge of its customs that might be expected of one who was born, reared and educated there, which exactly fits Moses' case.

2. The lists of stations on the journey of the Israelites could not have been invented. Nothing has been discovered to cast suspicion upon the record here furnished. This is one of the most troublesome chapters for the destructive critics. In fact, it stands as an insuperable barrier in their way. This is entirely

beyond the possibility of forgery. Nothing like it would have been attempted by any one living hundreds of years after the date of the Exodus.

3. The nations mentioned in Balaam's prophecy are such as existed in Moses' time, which is a remarkable fact, if the prophecy was written long after the conquest and subsequent to the time of David and Solomon.

4. There is an air of antiquity about the book, little vestiges here and there, that tend to confirm the Mosaic authorship.

All in all, it must be regarded as a wonderful book, full of instruction, abounding in great lessons, some of which we have hinted at in passing, but which we will not take space to enumerate. It logically belongs just where it is found, and constitutes an integral and essential part of the Pentateuch considered as one great production of a single writer, written with a distinct and clearly discoverable purpose.

CHAPTER XXI.

The Book of Deuteronomy.

The word "Deuteronomy" means second law. This name was given to this book because it is a repetition of the law given in previous books, with some additions dealing with matters not covered in previous legislation. There is also some repetition of history, but no new historical matter, except a record of the death of Moses with the attendant circumstances. It is in part a commentary on former laws, together with reasons for their enforcement. In the time covered, the book stands in striking contrast with the other books of the Pentateuch. Genesis covers the ground from creation to the time of Joseph. Exodus treats of the period from the birth of Moses to the erection of the Tabernacle at Sinai, a space of eighty years or more. Leviticus deals with the history of the encampment at Sinai, which lasted about a year. Numbers covers the history of forty-eight years of wandering in the desert. Deuteronomy is limited to the events of about five weeks just prior to the death of Moses. But, notwithstanding the brief interval covered, it is one of the most interesting and important books of the Pentateuch. It consists of three speeches of Moses and an added portion giving the song and blessing of Moses, and the story of his death, the latter doubtless having been added by the hand of his successor, Joshua.

It is interesting and instructive to study:

I. The reasons for a repetition of the law.*

These reasons stand as the best explanation and justification of the book

1. Repetition is the first great law of emphasis, and emphasis is required for the sake of recollection and practical application. Lest we forget, God must needs repeat his commands and instructions time and time again. "There must be precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, there a little," and even then we forget not only God's laws, but his benefits and blessings which are renewed every day. Is it any wonder that the great leader, knowing this tendency, which was so conspicuously characteristic of Israel, sought to impress the laws given by his hand by repeating them just before his departure?

2. The repetition serves to honor God's law and magnify its greatness and importance.

Last words are always interesting and important, and it is very suggestive that Moses' last words consisted of a repetition of the law. This fact was calculated to impress upon the people the necessity of understanding and remembering this divinely given code, covering so completely the whole range of civil and religious duties.

3. Moses was about to depart this life after a long and most important service to the nation.

This fact has a bearing on this question of repetition. What could be more natural than that the one who had led them under the guidance of God should recapitulate both the history that had transpired and the laws that had been given under his administration? Deuteronomy not only stands in natural and close relation to all that goes before, but from a psychological standpoint it is just what we would expect under the circumstances.

---

* "Henry's Bible," Vol. II., p. 424.

4. A new generation had arisen. They were not present when the law was first promulgated from Sinai, which was a matter not to be overlooked.

This fact demanded an impressive repetition of the law, if no other reason existed. This makes such a repetition a most reasonable and important thing. Justice to the new generation required it.

5. Canaan was about to be occupied, the crucial time was near at hand—that to which all previous time led.

Could there have been a better preparation for this new army, that was to accomplish the work for which their fathers had shown themselves incompetent, than to have their minds deeply impressed by the wonderful history of their nation and the marvelous code of laws committed to them? There is no higher stimulus for a great future than the recollection of a great past. What better way to kindle enthusiasm, strengthen patriotism and stimulate bravery than to call to mind the marvelous dealings of God with the nation? That nation is rich that inherits a great past.

II. The contents of the book.

1. The first division embraces four chapters.

It consists of an address in which Moses recounts the incidents of Sinai and the subsequent history of the wanderings. It is hortatory in character; that is, the history is recounted with a hortatory design, than which there could have been no better form of exhortation.

2. Beginning with chapter 5 and ending with chapter 26, we have recorded a second address of Moses.

This consists of a repetition of laws and their exposition, with slight added portions, mingled with promises and threatenings. The occupancy of the land is anticipated and instructions are given regulating life under the

new conditions. Duties of man to fellow-man under various circumstances are enjoined and warnings against idolatry are uttered; in short, social duties are emphasized.

3. The third address begins with chapter 30. In this address the blessings and cursings that follow obedience and disobedience are set forth. He closes with these wonderfully impressive words: "I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse: therefore, choose life, and thou mayest live, thou and thy seed: to love the Lord thy God, to obey his voice, and to cleave unto him: for he is thy life, and the length of thy days: that thou mayest dwell in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give them."

4. Chapter 31 is given to closing words of admonition. Joshua, in sight of the people, is admonished to be strong and of good courage. The duty of reading the law in a public way every seven years is enjoined, and the declaration is made and repeated that Moses wrote this law in a book and delivered it unto the priests.

A remarkable incident is recorded, beginning with verse 14: Joshua is called into the tent of meeting to receive a charge directly from God. Jehovah there foretells the apostasy of the nation that would occur in the land to which they were going, and the consequent punishments that would come upon them. Moses is instructed to write a song and teach it to the people, that it might become a witness against them in the time of departure from Jehovah, who had delivered them and led them into the goodly land.

Moses finally gives explicit instruction as to the preserving of the law he had written, and in sorrow, and

almost despair, he speaks of the corruption and departure from the right way sure to follow. How wonderfully it was all fulfilled in the future history of the nation.

5. Then comes the song (chapter 32) which God had commanded Moses to write, which we may call his dying song, which was recited or read in the hearing of the people. In this ode God's purpose to punish and reject the apostate nation, and the fulfillment of this purpose upon the rebellious people and upon the enemies of Israel who had led them astray, are set forth in a powerful way. In this poem the last of four great characteristics of Moses are disclosed, that cause him to stand forth as one of the greatest men of all time: He was (1) a great military leader, (2) a great lawgiver, (3) a great orator, (4) a great poet, and withal a man of marked piety, integrity and zeal. This ode has been called the song of the dying swan.

6. When we read chapter 33 (the continuation of the beautiful poem), we can but feel glad that it was written. It would have been a sad ending to a great life to have had it consist of words of denunciation and warning in which there was so little of cheer and hope. True, he never failed to speak the word of forgiveness and promise for the penitent, which fall here and there as gleams of light upon an otherwise dark picture, but it needed chapter 33 to complete the work of the great lawgiver in a way to satisfy our hearts. These are words of blessing. If God must needs use his servant to speak the word of warning, condemnation and judgment, we are glad he permitted him to make his parting message one of cheer, hope and blessing.

7. Chapter 34 is probably an appendix from the hand of Joshua, or some other authorized scribe.

True, it may have been written by Moses, by inspira-

tion anticipatory of his own death, but it is more reasonable to suppose it was written by another hand. It is an obituary notice of the great lawgiver who ascended Nebo, where he beheld the promised land he was not permitted to enter. The most remarkable and interesting statement is made that the great leader who had been so faithful to the task imposed upon him was buried by God himself. What more fitting end of a wonderful man and a wonderful career?

III. The purpose of the book.*

Let us try to get into the situation as Moses must have viewed it. We will thus be able to enter into his feelings and see the purpose with which he wrote. Or, if you prefer, let us try to see things with God's eyes, if we would understand the reasons for the words he put into the mouth of his servant. The first part of God's covenant with Abraham has been fulfilled. A great nation has been created and disciplined and fitted, through the wilderness experience, for the conquest of Canaan. It now may be regarded as a fact beyond the peradventure of a doubt that God will accomplish the second part; namely, give them the land he had promised them. All his dealings with the nation leave no room for doubt as to what the issue of the coming conflict must be. But Jehovah, who knows the end from the beginning, sees beyond the conquest to the apostasy that would occur, and Moses must have been filled with anxiety as to whether a people, hitherto rebellious and unfaithful, would remain faithful to him who had so marvelously led them, until in and through them the great purpose of God

*In this section I am much indebted to Marion Stevenson. See "Studies of the Bible," chapter on Deuteronomy.

to bless all nations could be accomplished. He may not have known what all the content of God's great purpose respecting humanity was, but he certainly knew that the welfare of the nation, if nothing more was involved, depended upon their faithfulness to Jehovah. We would therefore expect Moses in the closing days of his life to do everything in his power to insure that faithfulness in the people he loved. This would also stand as a witness between God and his people in view of the calamities destined to fall upon him. Faithfulness to Jehovah is therefore the burden of the book. How shall this be accomplished?

1. Moses himself had endured, "seeing him who is invisible," the writer of Hebrews tells us. That is, faith in the spiritual God was the strengthening force as set over against the idea of faith in the gods of men's hands. Hence, in the first address Moses directs their minds back to Sinai, when Jehovah spake to them out of the midst of the fire, and he reminds them that they heard God's words, but saw no form. He also appealed to universal history to prove that Jehovah was the only God. In an age of universal idolatry what better way to fortify the people against its encroachments, and thus cause them to remain faithful to Jehovah, than to teach them that God is a spirit and that beside him there is no other? How could they make an image, or bow down to worship one, if these two conceptions remained fixed in their minds?

2. Moses in the second address seeks to impress two attributes of God upon the people; namely, God's love and his vengeance.

The former he shows them was exhibited in the love of God for the nation, notwithstanding their waywardness, and the latter was revealed in his dealings with the

Egyptians who had been overthrown in the sea. This is really a psychological argument. Man is ruled by two great forces, love and fear, and these two principles Moses seeks to deeply instill into the nation. Those who try to banish fear from their religious systems show themselves to be both poor theologians and poor psychologists. Hence it is that law without a penalty is void. Thus far the attributes of Jehovah are brought to view as a safeguard against idolatry.

3. Moses knew, however, the proneness of men under prosperous circumstances to forget God, and he knew the people were going into a fruitful land where, as the Scripture saith, they would "wax fat."

The next purpose revealed in the address was to cause them to remember Jehovah: "And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be upon thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be for fronlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the doorposts of thy house, and upon thy gates."

To the end that the nation should remember, other expedients were to be used:

(1) A central sanctuary was to be provided where the men should gather three times a year for the great national feasts. Twenty times this sanctuary is referred to, from chapter 12 to chapter 26. "*Causa Memoriae*" explains it all. They could not forget Jehovah as long as they remained faithful to the central worship.

(2) When the nation should choose a king he must write a copy of the law with his own hand and read

it all the days of his life (Chapter 17). "Like king like people" is the thought.

(3) It was to be written on great stones set up at Mt. Ebal after they had crossed over Jordan. (Chapter 27.) Here, from Mt. Ebal and Mt. Gerizim, the blessings and cursings of the law were to be pronounced in hearing of the people.

(4) The law was to be read publicly every seventh year at the Feast of Tabernacles.

(5) A great national song was composed by Moses at God's direction, in which the dealings of God with Israel, together with threatenings and warnings were recounted. Thus Jehovah's name would be handed forward from generation to generation. Song is a powerful factor in stirring patriotism, stimulating memory, awakening enthusiasm and strengthening faith. All nations have their patriotic songs, which do more to unify the people and hold them to their traditions than any other force.

How could Israel forget Jehovah after the great lawgiver had taken such measures to cause him to be remembered from generation to generation?

IV. Evidences of the truthfulness of the book.

1. It bears witness to its own authority time and time again. If this witness is false, the morality of the act can not be defended. It is useless to say that it was ancient custom for writers to assign their productions to some great name and that consequently no moral turpitude is involved. Here the Mosaic authorship is imbedded in the very structure of the book. It is inconceivable that in a divinely inspired production this could have been done, if it were not true. Falsehood and deception are condemned by the Mosaic law. If Moses did

not write the book, a falsehood of the most glaring kind is perpetrated in the book that legislates against it, and all this in the name of Jehovah. Perish the thought.

2. Deuteronomy was more used by some of the prophets than any other book of the Pentateuch.

It had a wonderful influence, which could not have been the case if its authorship had been questioned. Hosea, Amos, Micah, Jeremiah and Isaiah refer to it.

3. It is cited by Christ and his apostles, as the work of Moses, notably in Matt. 19: 7, 8; Mark 10: 3-5; Acts 3: 22; 7: 37; Rom. 10: 5.

They evidently shared the general view of their time and of the great prophets of previous ages.

4. The style of the book supports the claim that it is largely a report of speeches of Moses orally delivered.

It is pre-eminently the style of oral hortatory speech. It is more rhetorical in language than the other books, just as oral speech would naturally be. If it was written in the time of Josiah by Hilkiah, or a company of designing priests, as some of the critics maintain, it is the most cunning and skillful forgery ever perpetrated. The claim involves a literary miracle. It shocks the moral sense of the average man, and imposes far too heavy a tax on his credulity. It certainly requires a peculiar type of mind, one in which the logical faculty is strangely wanting, to accept such a claim.

V. Some of the great lessons of the book.

Many of these have been directly or incidentally referred to. In addition, we cite a few of the more striking:

1. God's will is the foundation of order and blessedness. Infraction of the divine law results in destruction. Individual and national peace and blessedness depend

on faithfulness to the divine requirements. "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man."

2. Great service can not purchase immunity from punishment for individual shortcomings.

Miriam, Aaron and Moses, great as they were in personal characteristics and in service, must suffer the consequences of their transgressions. Even the great leader, on account of his one serious aberration, was not permitted to enter the promised land.

3. The greatest man is, after all, a limited man in feeling, purpose and power to help.

Moses was one of the greatest men the earth has seen, yet his feelings and purposes were limited to a single people, and his ability to help was dependent on the willingness of the people to be helped.

Jesus Christ, the great antitype of Moses, presents a great contrast to him in the scope of his sympathies and purpose. He was an unlimited man. He felt, thought and wrought for all mankind. He knew no limitations imposed by race or caste or class. He was the all-men's man, the brother of the race, in this respect far overtopping the loftiest men of all time.

4. Patriotism, fidelity to trust and devotion to duty are the characteristic qualities of great souls. Moses was an ardent lover of his people; he was faithful to the trust imposed upon him under the most trying circumstances, and no service or sacrifice was too great for him to give. In this he was typical of his great Antitype, of whom it was said: "He withheld not himself, but freely gave himself the just to die for the unjust." This is characteristic of the truly great.

5. To fall in line with God's purposes is the condition of happiness and the road to success. This is abundantly verified in Israel's history.

6. Great things can only be had by paying a great price.

Israel had to ascend through great tribulation. This is the universal rule. Those who escape the cross escape the crown. Those who seek ease and pleasure forfeit the highest reward.

7. To live a great life, make great sacrifice, endure great trials and afflictions, people must be strengthened by the power of the world to come.

Israel was drawn onward by the promise of the great inheritance. So it must be with us. Even of Christ it was said: "For the joy that was set before him he endured the cross, and despised the shame, and is now set down at the right hand of the majesty on high."

CONCLUSION.

It is with reluctance that I come to the close of this volume. I am conscious that my work has been very imperfectly done. So much might be said that I have not the ability to say, nor do my time and opportunity permit me to attempt a more elaborate work. This is sent forth with the prayer that it may have some mission of good in the field that God shall give it; that its faults may be excused and overlooked and its good points be found sufficient to justify its existence. My present purpose is to follow this volume by one on the historical, devotional and prophetical books, and by another on the books of the New Testament, which work I hope, by the blessing of God, to accomplish ere I go hence.

"And now may the peace of God that passeth all understanding abide upon us forever more."

THE END.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES CONSULTED.

I cheerfully and gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness to the following authorities, which have been helpful to me, either directly in the writing of the book or indirectly in my general study and preparation:

Smith's Bible Dictionary, Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature (Kitto), Bible Cyclopædia (Fausset), Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge, Johnson's Universal Cyclopædia, Chambers' Encyclopædia, Encyclopædia Britannica, Butler's Bible Work, Henry's Bible, Parker's People's Bible, "Types and Metaphors" (Monser), "Messianic Prophecy" (Briggs), "Hand-book of Christian Evidence" (Scott), "The Divine Demonstration" (Everest), "Authorship of Deuteronomy" (McGarvey), "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch" and "The Unity of the Pentateuch" (Green), Bissell's "Work on the Pentateuch,'" "Principles of Biblical Criticism" (Lias), "Prophetic Ideas and Ideals" (Jordan), "Hours with the Bible" (Geikie), "Studies in the Bible" (Stevenson), "Elements of the Higher Criticism" (Zenos), "Lex Mosaica."

OCT 6 1910

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: June 2005

Preservation Technologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

One copy del. to Cat. Div.

OCT 6 1906

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 381 163 3